

R  
559

# CHURCH HISTORY



VOL. I

DECEMBER, 1932

No. 4

THE ORGANIZATION BY NATIONS AT CONSTANCE

*Louise R. Loomis*

THE SCHOOL OF ST. VICTOR

*Joseph Patrick Healy*

JOHN DURY, ADVOCATE OF CHRISTIAN REUNION

*J. M. Batten*

BOOK REVIEWS

*Published by*

The American Society of Church History

# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888: REORGANIZED, 1906: INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE  
LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

## OFFICERS FOR 1932

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET ..... *President*  
CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN ..... *Vice President*  
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER ..... *Secretary*  
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS ..... *Treasurer*  
MATTHEW SPINKA ..... *Assistant Secretary*

## OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

HENRY JACOB WEBER	EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER
SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE	WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN
WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL	ABDEL ROSS WENTZ
GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	JOHN THOMAS MCNEILL
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON	JAMES MOFFATT

## EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*  
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS  
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, SCOTSDALE, PENNSYLVANIA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year must be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Church History, 610-614 Walnut Ave., Scottdale, Pa., or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Church History, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

Entered as second-class matter March 17, 1932, at the post office at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# CHURCH HISTORY

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, *ex officio*

VOL. I

DECEMBER, 1932

No. 4

## CONTENTS

### THE ORGANIZATION BY NATIONS AT CONSTANCE

By Louise R. Loomis, Wells College, Aurora-on-Cayuga,  
N. Y. 191

### THE SCHOOL OF ST. VICTOR

By Joseph Patrick Healy, Catholic University of America,  
Washington, D. C. 211

### JOHN DURY, ADVOCATE OF CHRISTIAN REUNION

By J. M. Batten, Scarritt College for Christian Workers,  
Nashville, Tenn. 222

AMONG THE MEMBERS 232

IN MEMORIAM 233

BOOK REVIEWS 234

JACKSON, A. V. W.: *Researches in Manichaeism* ... M. Sprengling

JORDAN, W. K.: *The Development of Religious  
Toleration in England* ..... M. M. Knappen

EMERTON, E.: *The Correspondence of Pope  
Gregory VII* ..... F. W. Buckler

WHITNEY, J. P.: *Hildebrandine Essays* ..... F. W. Buckler

MACDONALD, A. J.: *Hildebrand* ..... C. H. Moehlman

BETT, H.: *Nicholas of Cusa* ..... A. W. Nagler

JONES, RUFUS M.: *Mysticism and Democracy  
in the English Commonwealth* ..... Andrew C. Zenos

CHURCH, F. C.: *The Italian Reformers: 1534-  
1564* ..... John M. Lenhart

NEWMAN, A. H.: *Manual of Church History,  
Vol. II, Revised* ..... R. H. Nichols

STEPHAN-LEUBE: *Die Neuzeit* ..... W. Pauck

GILLETT, C. R.: *Burned Books* ..... Pierce Butler

- MULLIN, F. A.: *A History of the Work of the  
Cistercians in Yorkshire* ..... John T. McNeill
- TOURSCHER, F. E.: *The Hogan Schism* ..... A. C. McGiffert, Jr.
- BLOCK, M.: *The New Church in the New  
World* ..... R. E. E. Harkness
- McNAUGHT, J. C.: *The Celtic Church and the  
See of Peter* ..... T. P. Oakley



# Church History

VOL. I

DECEMBER, 1932

No. 4

## THE ORGANIZATION BY NATIONS AT CONSTANCE

LOUISE R. LOOMIS

Wells College, Aurora-on-Cayuga, New York

The Council of Constance, like any other serious event involving many people and lasting over a considerable period of time, can be studied from many points of view. It started out as a gathering for purely ecclesiastical purposes. But some twenty or thirty thousand persons from every class of society, except, perhaps, the lowest, cannot come and remain together for almost four years to discuss one set of difficult and complicated questions without, intentionally or unintentionally, raising many other questions, social, religious, philosophic, economic and political, and forming for the moment, as it were, a microcosm of the forces of the age. Most of the issues that agitated Europe five hundred years ago cropped up sooner or later at Constance, the cost of living, the obnoxiousness of robber barons and private warfare, the right and wrong of tyrannicide, the conflict between Germans and Poles in the East and between English and French in the West, to say nothing of the special issues with which the Council was expected to deal, the claims of three popes to be the only true successors of St. Peter, the perilous teachings of Wiclef and Hus and the worldliness and corruption of church administration.

One phase of the Council's activities is of particular interest to students of politics or of that social or psychological phenomenon which we call nationalism. For at Constance, national feeling early expressed itself in an organization by nations, in total disregard of papal will and ecumenical tradition, and national feeling affected the whole course of events, furthering progress at one stage and paralyzing it at another. Not that every state of Europe obtained recognition as a separate entity. The Scandinavian, Po-

lish and Hungarian envoys were obliged to combine with Germany and the Scotch with England to make a nation. When, in course of time, the Spaniards joined the Council, Aragon, Castile, Portugal and Navarre composed the new nation. With the French and the Italians each counting as one, there were in all but five nations instead of twelve or fifteen. But the dominant element in each group were men from one of the leading nationalities of western Europe and the group was looked upon as representing that nationality.<sup>1</sup> The vote of each nation in the Council counted as the equal of every other, whether the nation mustered three bishops present or eighty.

The steps by which the Council transformed itself from a homogeneous assembly of the prelates of Roman Christendom to a diversified aggregation of political units have been traced by such well-known historians as Creighton, Wylie, Valois and Kitts and, most recently, by Dr. George Powers in his *Nationalism at the Council of Constance*.<sup>2</sup> But these historians all wrote before the publication of the last volumes of Heinrich Finke's *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*,<sup>3</sup> a collection of documents that increases at many points our understanding of the Council's behavior and proceedings. It contains precisely the material in which the great seventeenth century collection of Von der Hardt is most deficient, namely, personal narrative, such as the journals of Cardinal Fillastre, Jacopo Cerretano and Guillaume de la Tour, and fugitive literature, letters, speeches, pamphlets and memoranda. Now it is possible to fill in more of the gaps between the official *Acta*, to get a sharper sense of clashing personalities and significant episodes, of ideas in process of formulation, of tides of passion as they ebbed and flowed.

With such material at hand for a more connected picture than we have had hitherto, it is of some interest to review even the familiar story of the revolutionary organization of the Council against papal authority. For the struggle to organize by nations was, of course, part of the Council's greater struggle to emancipate itself from Pope John XXIII and erect a framework of reformed,

<sup>1</sup> The difference between the "nation" at Constance and the "nation" at a thirteenth century university is the difference between an almost modern notion of nationality and a vague regionalism that classified men indiscriminately by provinces, districts or kingdoms. But the significance of the conception at Constance is a topic that needs further discussion.

<sup>2</sup> Washington, 1927.

<sup>3</sup> Münster, 1896-1929. Dr. Powers did not know Volumes III and IV of Finke's work and made only partial use of the material in Volume II.

constitutional church government for the future. The national system was justified on the ground that it was the only way of achieving a true and free representation of the Church universal. Five years earlier, the Council of Pisa had initiated such a system in the handling of its business. Deputies had been chosen from each of the four national groups of Italians, French, Germans and English to act with the cardinals as a sort of committee on agenda, to prepare measures for passage by the Council as a whole in formal session. However, the Council of Pisa was a thoroughly irregular body, sanctioned by neither one of the existing popes nor even by an emperor. In spite of the fact that John owed his position to it, he could hardly be expected to countenance its extraordinary methods of procedure in a council which he had convoked and over which he felt it imperative to preserve the customary papal control.

He himself was one of the first to reach Constance, in October, 1414, with plans all laid to have his own claims to the Roman see ratified and his two rivals repudiated and outlawed. A troop of his Italian bishops was also early on the spot, as well as forty or fifty newly created titular bishops, who, as Dietrich von Niem said, brought their staffs and mitres and nuptial robes, prepared to sit in glory with the dignitaries, although they had never held a see.<sup>4</sup> John himself said later that he had eighty prelates from Italy.<sup>5</sup> As a further precaution, he brought his secretaries and moneybags and a lavish stock of appointments and reservations with which to do business with the northern prelates as they appeared. The northerners straggled in slowly and there seemed for a while little prospect of concerted action among them. All intended to end the schism and accomplish something in the way of church reform but had vague and conflicting notions of how to set about it. Political and institutional prejudices, differences of language and habit kept them apart.

At the first meeting of prelates and delegates, called by John on November 11, in his palace, to agree upon a programme for the opening session, Cerretano says that they broke up into parties that talked out of order and not until the next day would they approve a set of harmless regulations for good conduct during the Council, including a provision for liberty of speech.<sup>6</sup> At the session in the

<sup>4</sup> Finke, *Acta Concilii Constanciensis*, III, 77-78.

<sup>5</sup> Von der Hardt, *Magnum Oecumenicum Concilium Constantiense*, II, 160; should be 260.

<sup>6</sup> Finke, II, 186.

cathedral, on November 16, over which John presided, the bull of convocation was read and then the set of regulations, after which the assemblage was asked if it accepted the regulations and answered in chorus: "Placet." The first session, at least, had observed the conventional forms but some already realized that it was merely a preliminary and that there were difficulties to come.

Three weeks of waiting ensued, broken by excitement over the arrival of emissaries from Pope Gregory XII and the arrest of John Hus. The Emperor was still occupied with his coronation at Aachen and none of the important kings had yet sent ambassadors. But men had begun gathering in groups to talk over what lay ahead, the cardinals, the jurists and theologians from the universities, contingents from the same country who understood one another's speech. The experienced French scholar and statesman, Cardinal d'Ailly, had arrived on November 18. On December 7, at a general conference of cardinals and bishops in John's palace, the Italians as one group and d'Ailly and the French prelates as another presented tentative programmes for starting the Council to work. The Italians proposed that John, to whose obedience the great majority present belonged, should immediately be recognized as true pope and forcible pressure brought to bear upon the other two claimants to resign. The French suggested that the others be given a hearing and a serious effort made to conciliate them and their obediences. Both parties agreed upon the need for drastic reforms in the Church and some limitations on the pope's arbitrary powers. Last of all, one Thomas Polton petitioned in the name of the English nation, "although as yet it has no prelates in the Council," that nothing definite be undertaken, except the proceedings against heresy, before the arrival of the English delegation, which was on its way.<sup>7</sup> The meeting adjourned without action but the lines of division were beginning to appear.

John had already set December 17 as the day for the second formal session and it was thought that a decree condemning the doctrines of Wiclef might be promulgated then. All were willing to unite in suppressing heresy. But the wording of the decree presented an unexpected problem. Finke prints the report of a meeting of forty doctors of theology, called by Cardinal d'Ailly to advise whether the decree should run in the Pope's name, "Nos (i. e. John) approbante Concilio dampnamus," or in the Council's, "Sacrosanctum Concilium presens etc. dampnat." D'Ailly argued that the latter was the proper form, because the Council was greater

<sup>7</sup> Finke, II, 17, 197-198. Von der Hardt, II, 194-195.

than the Pope, being the whole of which the Pope was but a part. He produced a pamphlet of his own, since lost, in which he is said to have stated that "as the king of France can be rebuked by his parliament and the parliament can pass judgment against him and issue sentence freely, so the Council can act against the Pope." In spite of d'Ailly's reasoning, however, only twelve out of the forty theologians sided with him. The rest declared that "the Council *per se* had no authority beyond what it derived from its head and in consequence should not as principal issue sentences or decrees. The head should do that, with the consent of the Council."<sup>8</sup> That d'Ailly himself felt he had been rash may be inferred from the defense which he drew up immediately afterward and the note which he sent to the Pope, in which he denied that he had likened the Council to a king's parliament.<sup>9</sup> But whether as a result of this debate or of the request that came from Sigismund, that nothing of importance be done before his arrival, John postponed the meeting of the second session until January 14.

Two more weeks of uneasy waiting and then at one o'clock on Christmas morning the Emperor and Empress passed in flaming procession through the city streets. There was now another power in Constance beside the Pope's but it was not yet certain what part it would play nor whether the Council would find it a support or an oppressor. Cerretano describes, first, the congregation of December 29, called at Sigismund's request, at which after advocating the use of conciliatory methods in dealing with John's rivals, he offered his own devoted services to the Council,<sup>10</sup> and, then, an incident that happened a few hours later, when Sigismund seized an envoy of the duke of Milan, whom he met on the Rhine bridge, and had him summarily evicted from the city. On December 31, an assembly met with the Pope to consider this incident and its implications and sent fifteen deputies, led by the bold d'Ailly, to inform Sigismund that the Council was at a standstill until its members knew whether they were safe to stay or go or speak as they saw fit. By this time Sigismund's temper was cooling and he knew the folly of antagonizing the Council at the outset. He tacitly acknowledged the rebuke and on January 4, sent the duke of Saxony to assure the meeting that all who had seats there and their households were free to come and go and say and do anything that concerned its business and he would protect them in that liberty. At the same time, he

<sup>8</sup> Finke, III, 47-48.

<sup>9</sup> Finke, III, 48-51.

<sup>10</sup> Finke, II, 201.



withdrew his opposition to the imprisonment of Hus.<sup>11</sup> Sigismund might be irascible and imperious but he could see that a policy of coöperation would serve his purposes better than one of coercion. Hardly, however, had he made his peace, when John raised the question of liberty in a new and serious form.

On January 10, at a congregation in the Pope's palace, Cardinal d'Ailly read a series of resolutions, endorsed by the doctors of theology, to provide for adequate review and consideration of every measure that might come up. The Council was to elect a committee of deputies from each nation to sit between sessions and hear the proposals of all, "however insignificant," who had any plans to suggest for the union and reformation of the Church, and prepare agenda for the sessions. The procedure would not be unlike that followed at the Council of Pisa. Propositions presented in one session should be voted on at the next and all votes counted by men chosen for the purpose, who would publicly announce the results. Decisions should be by majority vote. John should be recognized as true pope and the other two contestants offered inducements in the shape of high office to resign. If anyone questioned the right of a general council to assert itself over a pope, he should be told that "by the law of nature, the head of any body must be forcibly bound and restrained, if it violently attacks the members or tyrannizes irrationally over them."<sup>12</sup> A Polish witness describes what ensued. "When our lord Pope had heard it all, he made a gracious answer and said in public that he had seen the resolutions of the lord of Cambrai (Cardinal d'Ailly) and that they were well expressed and in general he approved their terms. But afterward he spoke to the lords cardinals apart on the subject and gave orders that no cardinal thereafter should propose any resolutions in Council or general congregation without the advice and consent of himself and the other cardinals." He forbade the doctors of theology to speak to d'Ailly or meet again at his house. Whereupon men everywhere began asking: "Should speech in a holy general council be free for everyone? \* \* Could a pope forbid or prevent a cardinal from speaking without his permission? \* \* Would such a pope and his advisers be violating the liberty of speech and dis-

<sup>11</sup> Finke, II, 202-203. It may have been about this time that the admonition was addressed to Sigismund on the difference between the spheres of king and priest, contained in Munich, Staats-Bibliothek, Codd. Latt., 15183, ff. 127a-128. "As the priest must proclaim freely the truth he hears from God, so the lay prince must defend faithfully the truth he hears from the priest."

<sup>12</sup> Finke, III, 54-59.



cussion promised by the King of the Romans and so encouraging schism? \* \* Are cardinals required to obey such a prohibition?"<sup>13</sup>

The episode seems to have been a signal for an outburst of rising indignation against John and the tactics which he was using to keep his authority unbroken. An anonymous theologian draws up a memorandum suggesting that in case Gregory and Benedict refuse to resign and leave John triumphant, it will become John's duty to abdicate also for the salvation of the Church, for the situation has reached a point where the interests of any individual must be sacrificed for the universal good and even papal power subjected to scrutiny.<sup>14</sup> A more outspoken writer appeals to Sigismund in vehement German. John must be eliminated, along with the other two. He is actually the worst of the three, a shedder of innocent blood, a Judas who sells God's service for gold and plunders the German church.<sup>15</sup> A member of the curia, with a taste for humanistic rhetoric, professes his embarrassment at addressing an emperor who himself has "drunk of the Heliconian fount" but who is "after God our only hope and refuge for the Church in her distress, without whose aid \* \* there is no prospect in sight of union." In pages of passionate Latin, he depicts the plight of the Council. Notices of assembly are not posted until the very hour set for meeting, although John's adherents have word long beforehand. The result is party gatherings of Italians, who act as John directs. Wherever men meet outside, in the nations or in the taverns, John's spies are on hand, terrifying them with threats and bribes, creeping back to their master at dead of night to report everything they have heard. If they cannot be shut out from the meetings of the nations, nobody will ever dare to do anything.

John's fine promises of free speech upon experience mean nothing. Sigismund may ask "what was done to Cardinal d'Ailly, Master Didacus, the Minorite, and the physician of Cardinal de Fieschi<sup>16</sup> and you will discover how the Council has lost its liberty." The curia itself is utterly corrupt and members of Sigismund's own household are being contaminated. Our German bishops may be heard professing one opinion before dinner and another after. So quickly minds are being manipulated! "We beseech you to come to the Council to stand for freedom of speech and the expulsion of the Pope's familiars from the congregations of the nations. \* \*

<sup>13</sup> Finke, III, 62-63.

<sup>14</sup> Finke, III, 59-60.

<sup>15</sup> Finke, III, 52-54.

<sup>16</sup> It is not known to what the writer is referring in the last two instances.

Unless you preside over us with your counsel, nothing good will be done. The Pope cannot lawfully be both judge and party in the case."<sup>17</sup>

The session postponed from December 17 had been set for January 14 but when that day arrived, it was postponed again, at Sigismund's request, to January 24 to wait for the coming of the envoys from France, England, Poland and Bohemia. There was merely an informal assembly, in which seats were assigned on the newly constructed banks of benches set up in the cathedral nave, "in accordance with the methods of procedure and dignity of the nations."<sup>18</sup> On January 23, John postponed the session once more, until February 4. Meanwhile the delegations for whom everyone was looking, "on whom", as Fillastre says, "great hopes were pinned,"<sup>19</sup> were beginning to appear, the English on January 21, the Poles on January 29, beside numerous other northern bishops and princes. The English cavalcade contained only twenty-seven dignitaries but it was led by Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, a forceful, practical man, who had been conspicuous at Pisa and who came determined this time to stop at nothing that was needed to put an end to the humiliating demoralization of the Church. His address to John on the day of his presentation at the papal court, was a solemn admonition to remember that heaven and earth were watching and that Christ, the Great Shepherd, had laid down his life for the sheep.<sup>20</sup> His address to Sigismund was a glorification of the opportunity Sigismund had to serve "the house of the Lord."<sup>21</sup> Within a short time after his arrival, Hallam had established a firm influence over Sigismund and the English and the Germans were finding that their attitude on many of the questions at issue was likely to be the same.<sup>22</sup>

On January 26, the envoys from Gregory XII waited upon the Emperor, who received them in audience with a group of prelates chosen from each nation. They brought an offer from Gregory to resign his claim to the papacy into the hands of the Council

<sup>17</sup> Finke, III, 66-74. For another German appeal to Sigismund, see Von der Hardt, II, 163, also Finke, IV, 653-654. A little later, Dietrich von Niem describes scornfully the rushing trade the Pope's court is doing in benefices, expectatives, etc. Finke, III, 76-79.

<sup>18</sup> Finke, III, 219; II, 207.

<sup>19</sup> Finke, II, 16-17.

<sup>20</sup> Finke, II, 394.

<sup>21</sup> Finke, II, 395.

<sup>22</sup> Anonymous letter in Finke, III, 239.

on condition that John were not presiding over it and that he and Benedict would follow Gregory's example. Several of John's partisans protested against the condition<sup>23</sup> but for the moment there was no other public response. On the 29th, the Polish ambassadors made their addresses to Pope and Emperor on the necessity for peace. Whereupon Cardinal Fillastre, a trained and clear-headed Frenchman like d'Ailly, seeing, as he says, that a door had been opened which no man had the courage to enter, handed to d'Ailly a memorandum definitely proposing the resignation of all three popes and declaring that by divine, natural and human law the Council was above the Pope in matters which affected the Church universal.<sup>24</sup> The paper passed rapidly from hand to hand. Sigismund welcomed it and sent copies of it to the nations, who heard it favorably. John saw it in anger and resentment but this time did not venture to retaliate. For the door once opened, there were plenty to step in after. Finke prints eight memorials, drawn up by as many men between the end of January and February 4 on ways to dispose of all three popes.<sup>25</sup> Fillastre says in his journal that the nations were circulating memorials to the same effect.<sup>26</sup>

But how was the Council to proceed with such an enterprise as long as so large a part of the voting body was kept under John's control? D'Ailly's earlier suggestion was being repeated, that deputies should be chosen to examine all plans that anyone wished to submit and pass them on to the nations, so that nothing should be hushed up or suppressed.<sup>27</sup> But of what avail, if John's adherents could outvote all the rest when it came to the public sessions?

"Meanwhile," says Fillastre, "the question arose as to who should be admitted to vote on the matters before the Council. Some (i. e. John and his party) wished to admit only bishops and greater prelates and abbots,"<sup>28</sup> i. e. those who had made up the councils of the Middle Ages. But now d'Ailly stepped forward again to propose that during the discussions on peace and union the membership be enlarged to include priors, canons and other lesser officials of the Church, whose experience and responsibilities were in many cases greater than those of the titular bishops, as well as

<sup>23</sup> Finke, III, 79-81.

<sup>24</sup> Finke, II, 18. Von der Hardt, II, 208-213.

<sup>25</sup> Finke, III, 82-92, 94-99.

<sup>26</sup> Finke, II, 19.

<sup>27</sup> Finke, III, 75, 93.

<sup>28</sup> Finke, II, 19.

university doctors of law and theology, whose learning would prove invaluable, and lay princes and envoys, without whose aid the decisions of the Council could not be executed. Such persons had taken part in the councils of the primitive Church and university doctors had voted at Pisa.<sup>29</sup> Cardinal Fillastre, growing still more audacious, urged the admission of parish priests, whose cures were far more extensive than those of most abbots, ruling over a paltry ten or twenty monks.<sup>30</sup> The nations seem to have adopted d'Ailly's proposals promptly in their meetings, if, indeed, they had ever drawn a line between voters and non-voters. In some instances, at least, they also granted the vote to priests.<sup>31</sup> The admission of all these elements meant certainly a trebling of the numbers entitled to vote,<sup>32</sup> a diminution of the influence of John's Italian prelates and a transformation of the active body of the Council from a purely ecclesiastical gathering to a miniature reproduction of the high society of Europe.

Still this was not enough. "It is clearly *de iure*," writes Fillastre, "that votes should be counted by heads, individually. Yet as long as there are almost more poor prelates from Italy than members of all the other nations together and, in addition, our lord has created an excessive number of prelates *in camera*, over fifty, it is said, because he wants to bind the crowd to himself by oaths and favors and intimidate the rest by threats, nothing can be accomplished by individual voting except what our lord wants."<sup>33</sup> The English, in particular, saw themselves swamped. Lay and clerical, they counted less than thirty in their nation.<sup>34</sup> Next to the Italian the French group was the largest and steadily increasing. A month later, Fillastre called it the largest of all, with four hundred members.<sup>35</sup> The leaders thus far in framing the new conciliar policies

<sup>29</sup> Von der Hardt, II, 224-227.

<sup>30</sup> Von der Hardt, II, 226-231.

<sup>31</sup> The Council as a whole never fixed the qualifications for voting membership. See the comment of the German nation, Von der Hardt, IV, 191, and the resolution of the French and Italian nations, Finke, II, 747. John, who, of course, would describe the change in the darkest colors, said that no distinctions were being drawn between "cleric and lay, single and married, graduate and non-graduate, noble and base." Von der Hardt, II, 157; should be 257.

<sup>32</sup> This estimate is based on lists of members of separate delegations and of the Council as a whole found in Von der Hardt and Finke, *passim*.

<sup>33</sup> Finke, II, 19.

<sup>34</sup> Finke, II, 208. In May, the cardinals were saying that there were less than twenty in the English nation. Finke, II, 34.

<sup>35</sup> Finke, II, 23.

had been Frenchmen. The English did not want to unseat John in order to hand the Church over to the French. A letter preserved in the British Museum from the archbishop of Canterbury to Hallam of Salisbury at Constance urges him to continue his vigilant efforts to keep the crafty French from recovering the power they once had over the Church.<sup>36</sup> Hallam may have pointed out to Sigismund the advantage it would be to both Germans and English if votes were counted by groups or nations in the sessions. What happened next is told most fully in Cerretano's diary.

"On Sunday, February 3, the reverend lords cardinals and all the prelates and envoys of the kings and lords who were attending the holy Council met in the apostolic palace at Constance and began to debate whether the second session, which had been postponed to Monday, February 4, should take place then and what should be done in it. At length, because of difficulties raised by the English nation, it was decided that the session should be prorogued to Wednesday, the 6th. And so our lord Pope prorogued it, with the assent of holy Council.

"On Wednesday, the 6th of the month, when it was expected that the session which had been prorogued would now be held, some men appeared on behalf of the nations of England and Germany and declared that if proceedings in Council were to be by individual vote, they would take no part in it and asked instead that an equal number of deputies be admitted from each nation, with power to discuss and settle on measures to promote a perfect union and reformation of the Church. So the session did not take place but was again prorogued.

"On Thursday, February 7, when the French nation was meeting as usual in its customary place, the question was raised there whether proceedings in Council should be by individual vote or by nation and it was decided that they should be by nation and not by individual vote, as the English and German nations had already demanded and agreed. It was the general opinion of all the wiser men that such a course would be a good beginning of union for the holy Church of God."<sup>37</sup>

The French diarist, de la Tour, says briefly: "Meanwhile the nations of France, Germany and England met by themselves and decided *de facto* the question whether proceedings should be by vote of nations or of individuals."<sup>38</sup> The uncertainty and suspense

<sup>36</sup> King's Mss., 10, B. IX, f. 59 b.

<sup>37</sup> Finke, II, 210-211.

<sup>38</sup> Finke, II, 353-354.



with which all this was attended is shown in an anonymous note which states that on Wednesday, the 6th, many of the French went to the cathedral, where the long postponed session was supposed to meet, and found neither Pope nor King there. So the assembly sat for a while in disorder and then word went around that the Pope had tacitly prorogued it again until February 15. But when that day came, once more there was neither session nor notice of postponement.<sup>39</sup>

The new proposition, one observes, had been modified in the process of agitation, perhaps as a concession to the French. It started as a development of the earlier idea of a commission of deputies chosen from each nation. It ended by allowing each nation to come as a whole, with as many members as it chose, into the sessions but to cast but one vote. It meant, of course, the instant reduction of the Italian vote to one in four and the practical stoppage of John's corruption of the northern clergy. For it would now be futile to buy off individuals. On these grounds, undoubtedly, the scheme was accepted by the French. But cardinals like d'Ailly and Fillastre who until now had led in devising ways to defend the Council from John's penetrating influence, looked on, as far as we hear, in silence. They could not oppose a plan that put an end to John's mischief forever. Yet the organization by nations left them in an anomalous position. Was the college to sit and vote as one nation among the rest or were its members, as Frenchmen or Italians, to join their fellow-countrymen and be swallowed up in the national crowd? The question of their status was never definitely settled and furnished occasion for suspicion and bitterness until the end.<sup>40</sup> Sigismund, we are told by de la Tour, suggested that his Hungarians form a nation.<sup>41</sup> They were a separate language group but they had not, apparently, set up regular meetings of their own nor made themselves felt as a unit in discussions of policy. The western nations did not regard them as equals in political rank and probably saw no need for increasing the votes under Sigismund's influence. At any rate, the suggestion was dropped.

<sup>39</sup> Finke, III, 220. See Peter de Pulka's letter to the University of Vienna on the general state of anxiety. *Archiv für Kunde Oester. Gesch. Quellen*, XV, 14-15.

<sup>40</sup> The relation of the cardinals, both singly and as a college, to the rest of the Council forms a subject by itself. They represented the papal principle, the royal ministry, in a legislature that had temporarily suspended the monarchy. See especially Fillastre's *Journal*, Finke, II, 34, and *passim*.

<sup>41</sup> Finke, II, 351.



Finke prints two pamphlets written while the debate was violent over the whole move. One is in the form of a letter to Sigismund from the Italian prelates. This device of voting by nations is a violation of natural and divine law, the decrees of pontiffs and the rules of previous councils and an insult to the honor and rights of the Italian nation. Is it just that a nation that can muster only three prelates at Constance (i. e. the English) should have a vote equal to one that has thirty (i. e. perhaps, the German)? If Sigismund approves such a scheme, schism will be added to schism and division to division. "For why distinguish before God in things spiritual between an Italian and a German, an Englishman and a Frenchman?" Or why stop with four nations or five? Who shall decide how many Christian nations there are? The Italians are not inferior to others "in letters, sciences, morals, virtue, zeal for the faith, religious devotion, perception of truth, desire for holy unity," for which they labored at Pisa and will labor again with all their strength. Sigismund as their emperor will surely protect them from such injustice. "We have reached the point, most august prince, where laws should be enforced, not broken at any man's whim."<sup>42</sup>

Pope John himself, in the defense he later sent to the French for his flight from Constance, followed much the same line of reasoning. A council should not be split apart into separate congregations. It is contrary to all law and right procedure. The English nation is absurdly small. Sigismund is using it, his Germans and a few so-called Frenchmen to get the whole assemblage into his clutches. The bishop of Salisbury thinks himself a bigger man than the Pope, bigger than all the rest of the Council.<sup>43</sup>

An answer to these arguments is in the second pamphlet, an anonymous address to the lords and fathers of the Council. Canon law requires that acts of council be based on common consent but does not prescribe how that consent is to be expressed. It may even be tacit. Records show that it has been the practice for councils to vote in unison "Placet." If it were necessary to collect the vote of each separate member, proctors could not be permitted to represent kingdoms, provinces, universities or chapters. If kingdoms can be represented by proctors, certainly nations can be so represented in the sessions, particularly when the members of the nation are all present and acquiescing in what is done. "It may

<sup>42</sup> Finke, III, 102-104.

<sup>43</sup> Von der Hardt, II, 153-162; should be 253-262.

even be said that the individual bodies that compose the Council are voting individually. For the Council is made up of nations, each nation forming by itself one body with one vote. So when the vote of each nation is counted, the votes of the individual bodies making up the Council are and will be counted."<sup>44</sup> The Council of Pisa used a similar mode of procedure, *de iure communi*, to expedite its work and the Council of Constance has an equal right to do what seems best. Whoever declares that the Council of Pisa could not *de iure* take such a step implies that John is no true pope and we are back "in the state of the Church in which we were before Pisa." Even the opposition of the Italians does not *de iure* invalidate this method, for the other three nations form a majority and have a right to do what will restore the union and the "natural use" of the Church of God.<sup>45</sup>

But this is mostly negative arguing, a reply to legal objections. Only at the end comes the hint at the real justification for the move, which everyone understood but no one, apparently, dared yet put brazenly into written words. Two years later, they could be bolder. The English, in their controversy with the French in 1417 over their right to remain a nation after the coming of the Spaniards, summed up the matter frankly. "In these days, it does not seem reasonable that a horde of prelates from one region, with insignificant dioceses and titles, brought up here for the purpose of outnumbering the rest of the assembly, should subject all parts of the world, with different habits and modes of life, to their will in Council."<sup>46</sup>

For some days after February 7 there was a pause. John's courage was shaken and he made no further move to call a session. The nations turned their attention to the problem of what was to be done with him. Indignation was still hot against him and criminal charges were being raked up to blacken his past career. "On February 15," says Cerretano, "after various consultations had taken place in the German, French and English nations on the method and way of uniting the Church and it had been decided between them that the way of abdication was the safest and most certain \* \* and the glorious prince Sigismund \* \* had signified his approval," the bishop of Toulon, an eloquent orator, was sent

<sup>44</sup> A reference, perhaps, to the medieval legal theory of the position of *corpora* within a larger unit. Gierke, *Political Theory of the Middle Ages*, transl. Maitland, 167, n. 229.

<sup>45</sup> Finke, III, 100-102.

<sup>46</sup> Von der Hardt, V, 98.

by the three nations to the Italians, who "were meeting that day in their usual place, to invite that nation in the name of the lord King and the other nations to join them in one undertaking, namely, an appeal to our lord Pope John XXIII" to resign. The Italians were by now willing to admit that John should abdicate but hoped that he might be about to do it of his own accord. They were not ready to join the northerners in putting pressure on him. The other nations did not hesitate. They were, they said, and they represented a majority of holy Council and that same day they sent to John a formal demand for his resignation.<sup>47</sup>

John, perceiving that the ground was fast crumbling under his feet, called a congregation the next evening in his palace and had the Florentine cardinal, Zabarella, read a vague and indefinite promise to resign, after his rivals had done so.<sup>48</sup> The three nations conferred again and requested something more positive. On the 21st, John called a second meeting and offered a slightly more definite but still unsatisfactory formula. The three nations then worked out a clear and binding formula of their own, which Sigismund presented to a congregation of the whole Council in the church of the Franciscan monastery. The delegates of the French universities of Paris, Orleans, Montpellier and Avignon had meanwhile arrived in Constance. Sigismund had realized at once the importance of securing their approbation and had taken some of them to a meeting of the German nation, where he harangued them on their obligation to coöperate with the Germans and English and explained the reasons for the new system of voting and for the decision to insist upon John's abdication.<sup>49</sup> John at the same time had been trying to win them to his side. "What pressure our lord brought to bear on them they alone know," says Fillastre.<sup>50</sup> When they now appeared before the congregation and expressed their approval of the formula, with merely the addition of three words to make it more stringent, all the forces of the Council, "with the exception of some of the Italian nation,"<sup>51</sup> were banded against the Pope. On March 2, the long delayed second session was held. John presided, as before, but at the end of the opening mass he read from his throne with dramatic emotion the pledge of abdica-

<sup>47</sup> Finke, II, 211-212; Von der Hardt, II, 230-232.

<sup>48</sup> The text of this and of John's second promise is given by Fillastre, Finke, II, 20.

<sup>49</sup> Von der Hardt, II, 236.

<sup>50</sup> Finke, II, 21.

<sup>51</sup> Finke, II, 356.

tion which the nations had composed. The bishop of Toulon voiced the gratitude of the Council and the Emperor knelt and kissed the Pope's foot. The choir sang *Te Deum Laudamus*. The council of nations had won a clear victory.

An incident that occurred shortly afterward, related in de la Tour's diary, showed how fast the nations were assuming the rights of initiative and control. On March 5, a splendid company of ambassadors arrived from the king of France. Upon their presentation to the Pope they asked him to call a formal session of the Council to receive the message they had brought. John readily consented but on hearing of this, the French, German and English nations, with Sigismund, went into a debate that lasted three days. Finally, "after long altercation," they resolved "that the said ambassadors should be heard in a public audience of the character of a public consistory but not of the character of a session, because in a public session there must be nothing proposed or published which all the nations have not previously agreed and concluded shall be approved and decreed there." So, on March 11, the French ambassadors were received in the cathedral by Pope, Emperor and a vast throng of spectators but without the formalities of a session.<sup>52</sup> A week later, an ill-judged attempt of Sigismund to overawe the French nation and intrude upon its privacy of debate in order to bring about a quicker agreement with the Germans and the English, created instant resentment and Sigismund apologetically withdrew.<sup>53</sup>

How, soon afterward, John fled from Constance everyone knows, as also how the Council, recovering from its first consternation, held its third session and voted, even as other revolutionary bodies under comparable circumstances have done, that it was there on its own authority and would not leave until its work was done. No decree was ever passed legitimizing the organization by nations. The Italians had tacitly accepted it and that was enough. There was some experimenting with forms of order in the public sessions. After John's flight the senior cardinal bishop was accepted as presiding officer and at the first two sessions the junior cardinal deacon, Zabarella, read aloud for ratification the resolutions passed by the nations in their separate assemblies. But on

---

<sup>52</sup> Finke, II, 356-357. A brief account of the same incident is in a letter sent to Poland. Finke, III, 263.

<sup>53</sup> This interesting episode is described, with different details, by each of the three journalists. Finke, II, 23-24, 221-223, 357-358. Von der Hardt's summary account of it, IV, 57, is mistaken in several respects.

the second occasion he omitted a clause of which he and many other cardinals disapproved and the nations thereafter appointed different persons to do the reading and notaries from each nation were supplied with copies of the resolutions, that they might follow and make sure it was correct. The assent of the Council was at first expressed by the general murmur, "Placet," but beginning with the session of May 2, four dignitaries, one from each nation, stood up and responded in turn, each for his nation: "Placet."<sup>54</sup>

The internal organization of the nations seems never to have been uniform. They all elected presidents every month and deputies to act as committees on agenda and conduct negotiations between them. But in the management of their separate affairs there was, apparently, always some variation in rules and in the strictness with which the rules were enforced. A set of resolutions drawn up in the German nation in May, 1415, emphasizes the need of doing business in an orderly and legal manner, "so that we shall not be reprehensibly behind the other nations in diligence and discretion." Every measure proposed by the deputies is to be thoroughly discussed in full meeting at least twenty-four hours before the vote is taken. Votes are to be read aloud, so that every man may have a chance to know what his neighbor thinks and why. Full and proper records are to be kept. The example of the French nation in assigning fixed seats to members qualified to vote is recommended for imitation. If precautions like these are not taken, it may easily happen that only the deputies of a nation know what is coming up in a session and the majority finds itself listening to the promulgation of decrees it has never approved.<sup>55</sup>

In the late summer of the following year, while they waited for the return of Sigismund from his travels, there was a more widespread movement to establish uniformity and order. Fillastre complains constantly of the lawless way in which things were being done and of the ignorance of the Council at large of acts published in its name.<sup>56</sup> Finke prints three sets of *Regulations for form and order, membership and business in the Council*, one of them anonymous, the second the product of the French and Italian nations, the third of the college of cardinals. They are all similar in essential

<sup>54</sup> This practice lasted until 1417, when "because of the dissension between the nations as to the order in which they should make the response of approval" the senior cardinal replied, "Placet," for all. Von der Hardt, IV, 1433-1434.

<sup>55</sup> Von der Hart, IV, 190-192.

<sup>56</sup> Finke, II, 65 and *passim*. See also the closing paragraph of the *Regulations*, Finke, II, 758.



provisions and differ chiefly in length and detail.<sup>57</sup> The first opens with a short preamble to the effect that the Council of Constance has no head to govern it and therefore cannot follow the forms laid down in "the sacred canons and records of ancient councils. \* \* For special reasons it was necessary at the outset to resort to peculiar methods in the transaction of its pressing affairs, such as deliberation by nations, etc., which methods cannot lightly be changed." Hence the need of setting down regulations. "For hitherto, in frequent instances, regulations have not been sufficiently enforced."<sup>58</sup>

The rules require each nation to keep a written list of persons eligible to membership and to decide all questions brought before it by majority vote, taking into consideration the rank, dignity and merits of the voters. The presidents and deputies of the nations are to meet together with the deputies of the cardinals, on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday mornings, to prepare all business for presentation to their nations, which meet on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. They are to report to the nations fairly and fully each problem as it arises, taking pains to show no partiality in their reports and encouraging thorough discussion before voting. If the decisions of all the nations are in harmony, the matter is settled and it only remains to draw up a decree for formal ratification in a session. If the nations disagree, the deputies must do what they can to adjust differences and then refer the subject back to the nations for further discussion until an accord is reached. For "always the place for the final correction, where measures to be ratified in the session must previously be read and accepted, shall be the nations, unless \* \* they make another arrangement in a special case."<sup>59</sup> None of these rules however, was universally adopted, a fact for which Fillastre blames the English and German nations. Persons in those nations, he says darkly, "who were used to dominating, fought the regulations bitterly, because they saw that they would deprive them of their authority."<sup>60</sup> Each nation continued to govern itself as before.<sup>61</sup>

So what John intended to be a unified assembly of prelates,

<sup>57</sup> Finke, II, 742-758.

<sup>58</sup> Finke, II, 742.

<sup>59</sup> Finke, II, 754.

<sup>60</sup> Finke, II, 65, 71-72.

<sup>61</sup> Almost no records of the activities of individual nations have been preserved. An exceptional document is the full and animated report of the doings and discussions of the French nation, October 15 to December 2, 1415. Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus*, II, 1543-1609.



governed by himself, turned into a congress of self-governing nations, the first of modern times. For at Pisa, the national organization had been less complete. As a congress of nations, the Council of Constance ended the schism and obtained the support of Europe for the new pope whom it eventually elected. Given the existing situation, it is difficult to see how such a result could have been brought about as successfully in any other way. For that reason, doubtless, the most able and devoted churchmen of the day, of every nation and party, accepted the arrangement, even when it worked to their personal disadvantage.

But the Council displayed also the shortcomings to which we have since become accustomed in international gatherings. It could combine to assert its own authority and to remove or crush what seemed a dangerous opponent, a refractory pope, or a heretic from Bohemia. But when it came to the more delicate questions of constructive reform, political jealousies, rancors and pride, joined to old ecclesiastical dissensions, tore it apart. Agincourt was fought, the English overran France while the Council sat on at Constance. Sigismund did not maintain his original pose of impartiality but allied himself with Henry V against Charles VI. What wonder that even in the sight of God Frenchmen remembered that they were French and Englishmen that they were English and each nation was quick to take offense and determined not to be outdone in precedence or privilege by the other.<sup>62</sup> The reform commissioners industriously recommended reforms that were never acted upon. Sigismund's efforts to persuade or bully the nations resulted only in the loss of most of his earlier prestige. Once Martin V had been elected and the special emergency that had brought them all together was over, the Council fell into a hopeless welter of contending factions. Five months after the election, a few perfunctory and ineffectual reform decrees were passed and ratified and three days later the Council was dismissed.

The sense of unity in the common mother Church and of joint responsibility for her welfare was too weak to overcome the particular loyalties and animosities of a body so conscious from the first of national divisions. An assembly of units that are losing or have never developed a loyalty to a larger whole sufficient to in-

<sup>62</sup> As early as January, 1415, one of the programmes drawn up for dealing with John included the proviso that equality must be preserved between nations to avert suspicion. Finke, III, 84. In February of the same year, Dietrich von Niem was deploring the arrogance and hostility shown in the intercourse between nations and wishing that all the best prelates, regardless of nationality, would get together and take the helm. Finke, III, 107-109.

duce them to subordinate local interests or prejudices to the wider good can never, it seems, do more than provide some shift for a passing emergency, can never build the difficult structure of peace and reform for the future. The more we read of the records of Constance, the more we find national feeling obtruding itself at every turn and the more we realize that the distance from Constance to Geneva, though long in time, in spirit is regrettably short.

## THE MYSTICISM OF THE SCHOOL OF SAINT VICTOR

PATRICK JOSEPH HEALY

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The School of St. Victor derived its name from the monastery, or rather priory, of St. Victor, situated near Paris. The monastery became a school when William of Champeaux, in 1108, gave up his chair of philosophy at the Cathedral school in Paris and retired there to devote his life to monastic seclusion. His reputation as a teacher was such that students followed him to the monastery and at their insistence he resumed his career as teacher, and continued to give lectures until he was promoted to the bishopric of Chalons-sur-Marne. The place, however, owes its fame as a center of philosophical studies not to William of Champeaux, but primarily to Hugh the founder of its system of mysticism and in a less degree to Richard the scholar, and to Adam the poet. Hugh of St. Victor, in the opinion of his contemporaries and of some of the most discriminating of modern writers, deserves to rank not only with the greatest of the philosophers and theologians of the twelfth century but of the entire Middle Ages. He was an indefatigable student, a man of broad culture, of independent judgment, and a scholar who influenced profoundly the course of philosophical and theological thought and speculation. Though there is considerable discussion as to his nationality it seems reasonably certain that he received his early education in the monastery of Hamersleben near Halberstadt. It was in order to become a student of William of Champeaux that he came to Paris and to the monastery of St. Victor. He commenced to teach in 1115, and from 1133 until his death in 1141 he was the head of the school. The reproach which was so frequently brought against Hugh that he was opposed to profane science is shown by Ueberweg-Baumgartner to be utterly without foundation, and it is clearly proved that he was interested in all science, and that he was convinced that secular art and science are valuable auxiliaries in the promotion of theological knowledge. His writings embrace treatises on theology, philosophy and exegesis, together with several works dealing expressly with mysticism or contemplation. The best known of these works on the subject of mysticism are *De Contemplatione et*

*ejus Speciebus, De Meditando, De Amore Sponsi ad Sponsam, De Arca Noe Mystica, De Arca Noe Morali, De Vanitate Mundi, De Arrha Animae, De Laude Caritatis, De Modo Orandi.*

The second great figure in the School of St. Victor was Richard. He too was a scholastic and mystic. Richard succeeded Hugh as head of the school in 1141 and directed it until his death in 1173. Though in thought and method Richard followed closely in the footsteps of Hugh, his work was not a mere repetition of what Hugh had taught, and under his hands mystical theology became very thoroughly systematized. His principal mystical works are: *De Preparatione Animi ad Contemplationem, seu Liber dictus Benjamin Minor*; *De Gratia Contemplationis, seu Benjamin Major*; *De Statu Interioris Hominis*; *De Exterminatione Mali et Promotione Boni*. The third teacher of prominence in the school was Adam who died in 1177. The thought of Adam was more intuitive and less dialectical than that of his predecessors. His principal work is in the form of *Sequences* or a series of *Rhythmic Proses* for many feasts of the liturgical year.

These three authors may be taken to represent the most flourishing period of the School of St. Victor, and their writings as the most characteristic expression of its teaching on the subject of mysticism. In the writings of each there is much that is individual and distinctive, but after due allowance has been made for individual differences in conception and method, enough that is common to all three will remain to enable us to arrive at some conclusion as to the place the School of St. Victor holds in the general history of Christian mysticism.

This history commences with the promulgation of the Gospel itself, and may be traced through all times and places in which men are to be found striving to attain evangelical perfection. Zöckler<sup>1</sup> and Pourrat<sup>2</sup> have, each in his own way and each from his own point of view traced in outline the narrative of this earnest but varied struggle to attain holiness or the highest Christian standard in conduct. They have pointed out the various stages through which the struggle passed, and how, from being in the beginning apparently unconscious and unstudied, the search for perfection became conscious and formal, how, frequently, the methods followed by one mystic were adopted by many as a rule of life, how in the course of time the pursuit of perfection became systematised and organised, and how there was gradually developed a formal

<sup>1</sup> *Askese und Mönchtum*, Frankfurt, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> *La Spiritualité Chrétienne*, 3 vols, Paris, 1920 seq.

pedagogy of sanctity. The life of the mystic or the great ascetic is a matter of admiration to most people and often an object of emulation to many. For this reason there would appear to have been a demand, on the part of some who were desirous of rising to closer union with the divine, to be better acquainted with the spiritual experiences of those who had attained excellence in the spiritual life. Hence it is that for many centuries the treatises on spiritual striving took the form of narratives of personal experience. The early writings of the mystics are not so much exhortations to perfection as descriptions of the difficulties to be encountered on the way to that supreme goal and of the means by which these difficulties might be overcome. St. Augustine, the Prince of Mystics as he has been called, gives an elaborate analysis of the perfection to which a sincere Christian may attain, and how it may be attained, and what is true of St. Augustine is true also of St. Gregory, St. John Climacus, St. Maximus and the other great writers of the early church. What each of these had to say on the subject of mysticism was presented as a matter of personal experience. It was assumed apparently that the course of everybody who entered on the path of perfection would be approximately the same, that in every case the goal and guerdon of mystical striving would be closer union with God through contemplation, and for those who excelled in contemplation, the vision of God Himself.

It is possible from the copious references to mysticism in the works of St. Augustine and the other early writers on this subject to formulate a definite theory or theology of mysticism, though these writers never attempted to present their thought in a systematized or scientific form. It is entirely different with the writers of the School of St. Victor. They viewed mysticism as being susceptible of scientific analysis and presentation, and they are credited with having reduced "the theory and practice of contemplation to a science in the approved scholastic manner then coming into fashion". This new method of approach, new at least in the Western church, led to a sweeping revision of thought on the subject of mysticism and mystical states, which was, however, quite in keeping with the scholasticism of the time and with the tendency towards the use of the dialectical method.

This, then, may be considered the first and most obvious contribution of the School of St. Victor to the mystical thought of the Western church. Mysticism was systematised. Under this new impulse mysticism ceased largely to be individual and spontaneous and to become studied and scientific, to be concerned with the

process of contemplation rather than with contemplation itself. This characteristic of the mystical teaching of the leaders of the School of St. Victor, namely that it was scientific, was, apart from the influence of Scotus Erigena, the result of their insistence on the unity of all knowledge and science. For them there were no profane sciences, no secular or irreligious arts. All science was religious, for all science and knowledge, no matter whence derived, open up to men the created world in which God has revealed Himself, just as all art leads to God, or can be made to serve the purposes of religion. To the writers of the School of St. Victor there was no hard and fast distinction between the natural and the supernatural, between the object of faith and the object of philosophy. The attitude of the Victorines on the subject of knowledge was a decided advance on that of the early scholastics. This advance has been expressed by saying that to the "Credo ut intelligam" and the "Intelligo ut credam" they added a third principle, "Amo ut intelligam," a principle which, they contended, synthesized the spiritual and emotional elements of human life, and brought them into relation with the other world as well as with this.

The key to the character of any system of mysticism is to be found in its theory of knowledge and in its doctrine of the relation of faith to knowledge. The theory of the Victorines was that all knowledge is merely a preliminary step to the mystical life, that science, to be worthy of the name, should lead to union with God. This progressive passage from knowledge to mystical union was described as consisting of three main stages, each of which led upward to God by many different degrees or steps. The three main divisions in the march towards union with the divine, were Thought (*cogitatio*) during which the mind was busy with the investigation of the material universe; Meditation (*meditatio*) in which the soul, turned inward on itself, seeks God through a discursive process; and Contemplation (*contemplatio*) in which the soul is united with God in mystical contemplation or ecstasy. The entire system of the Victorines is concerned with the scientific analysis of these three stages, and it is in this analysis that they build up their pedagogy and their philosophy. The first stage, that of Thought is worked out in full detail by Hugh, whose *Didascalicon* is a treatise on methodology, the most striking characteristic of which is its comprehensive enumeration of all the sciences with an explanation of how all may be made useful in promoting the real end of true knowledge, union with God. It is significant that the insistence on mysticism brought Hugh close to nature because the constantly re-



curing thought in all his works is that the object of contemplation is not supernatural truth alone but all truth. The key to a short but comprehensive explanation of what is specifically mystical in the teaching of the School of St. Victor is to be found in the analysis of these three stages or processes.

The supreme end of life is the pursuit of wisdom, which he who finds is happy and he who has is holy. The first step, on the way to this consummation of happiness and holiness through wisdom was the acknowledgment that there is no such thing as profane science, that all knowledge is sacred, for all knowledge leads to God. The soul, according to Hugh, can contemplate God in three ways—in Himself, in His works, and in His judgments; in Himself it contemplates His goodness, in His works His greatness, and in His judgments His mercy, and His justice. In Himself the soul finds an object of love, in His works an object of awe and admiration, and in His judgments an object of fear and dread.

The transition from scientific truth to mystical contemplation and the inclusion of both in a systematic scheme of life would not have been possible without a definite theory of the nature of the created universe and how it ought to be viewed philosophically. The theory evolved by the teachers of the School of St. Victor was that the world should be viewed symbolically and that all nature is a great book. It is not necessary to say that the symbolical conception of the universe which ran through all the thought of the school was derived from Plato, and that through the same influence discursive processes were rejected in favor of the intuitive. Dialectic did not play the sole part in the epistemology of the Victorines, for their purpose was not only the pursuit of truth, by the inductive or deductive processes of Aristotle, but an effort to penetrate to an understanding of the symbols in which truth is veiled. The symbolical conception of the universe which prevailed at St. Victor was merely another form, or rather an extension to all created nature, of the symbolical or allegorical method of conceiving the text of the Bible which had been in vogue from the earliest days of the church. Thus the general principle of the symbolism which prevailed might be expressed by saying that as God spoke in the revealed word under symbolic and allegorical forms, so too, in creation He has left another great book, which will render up its secrets to those who discover the key to its symbolism. This book is the creation, which is not only an expression of God's handiwork but of God's thought. Each creature is distinct in itself, and each has a separate meaning. Each conveys a particular thought or

message. All taken together form an immense volume in which is contained under symbolical forms the thought and teaching of the Almighty.

The pages of this book would forever remain closed and undeciphered were it not that the soul of man is endowed with a twofold power or capacity, which enables it at the same time to discern and understand the beauty of external realities, and to penetrate from the external or symbolic to the internal and real. Man alone has this twofold capacity or power of knowing and understanding the sensible and the immaterial. This power of discerning the hidden truth, of knowing the underlying reality, must be trained and cultivated, because all men are not capable of passing from the world of sense to the world of the spirit, from the symbol to the reality. This incapacity to read in its true terms the book of the universe is a result of original sin. Had our first parents not sinned the inner sense of the universe would lie open before the eyes of all, and all, knowing the goodness and greatness of God as revealed in His creatures, would have given Him praise and thanks.

The restoration of man to his birthright was accomplished through the incarnation, and a new gift was offered to him in the sacred Humanity of Christ. Hugh says: "The Word took flesh without losing the divinity, and He offered Himself to man like a book written within and without: externally by the humanity, and internally by the divinity, in order that He might be read outwardly by imitation and inwardly by contemplation; outwardly to heal us, and inwardly to lead us to happiness. Inwardly we read, 'In the beginning was the Word'; and outwardly, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us'. This book is unique, written once within and twice without: first by the creation of the visible world, and then by the incarnation; the first time in order to afford us a pleasurable sight; the second, to heal us; the first in order to create nature; the second to redress the fall".<sup>3</sup> The work of restoration was completed by the institution of the sacraments. In the sacramental system the Victorines found an additional argument and evidence of the symbolic character of the universe. The sacraments are themselves signs and symbols which under their external appearance contain a spiritual reality, and thus teach men to seek the spiritual in the sensible and the visible.

This symbolical view of the universe, which found such a deeply seated basis in the system of the Victorines did much to

<sup>3</sup> Hugh, *De Sacramentis*, Lib. VI, cap. V. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXVI.

color the thought of the time, and hence it is not surprising that we find a new natural history coming into being in which minerals, plants and animals commenced to receive a special symbolical or mystical meaning of their own. This symbolism was put to general use by artists and architects, but it also produced the bestiaries and the works on gems which form such a large part of the fanciful and fantastic literature of the period.

Starting with this universal symbolism in nature as the basis of their system, the teachers of St. Victor next undertook to describe the manner in which the soul might safely and surely pass from the symbol to the reality, that is from the stage of thought to the second stage that of meditation. These spheres of mental or spiritual experience are not wholly separate; thought and meditation are not only closely related, they even overlap. Meditation is a soul process in which the mind seeks to know by converse with self something of the nature, the condition and the causes of things, in order to be led back to a knowledge of the reason and purpose of their existence. The subjects of meditation may be the universe or created nature, the Scriptures, or conduct and morals. Meditation on creatures and the Scriptures is necessary and fruitful because each in its own way contains a revelation of the divine mind. Meditation on conduct and on moral subjects is necessary because in this way will it be found how the knowledge of the true may be transformed into the practice of goodness. Hugh lays great stress on the necessity of moral perfection in order to make progress in the acquisition of divine truth. He devotes two treatises, *De Arca Noe Mystica* and *De Arca Noe Morali*, to a discussion of the obstacles which lie in the way of a seeker after perfection and which must be removed before he can attain to spiritual peace. In another of his works, *De Vanitate Mundi*, he analyses the difficulties which the world offers to those who seek to escape its lures.

Inasmuch as man left to his own unaided efforts can make little moral or spiritual progress, he must have the aid of divine grace, which comes through prayer. Human weakness and the need of divine mercy are sufficient motives for prayer. The misery of man and the mercy of God are the two wings which sustain prayer, but prayer is at the same time a cause as well as a result of meditation; for only those who know the extent of their own weakness and the depth of divine goodness can pray with profit. To this subject Hugh devoted another treatise, *De Modo Orandi*. Prayer, however, must not be sterile. It must lead to action, that is to the cultivation of the virtues, to the observance of the law and

the practice of the counsels of perfection, the observance of faith, hope and charity and the other virtues of the Christian state. When the soul has succeeded in overcoming the lower passions, when it has mastered sense, and grown accustomed to the ways of virtue, it is ready for the last and highest stage, that of contemplation. Then it may hope to enjoy great calm and peace in the assurance and knowledge of divine love. "Thus", Hugh says, "when at the beginning the soul, in the midst of trials, seeks light in meditation, there is flame and smoke; when it has attained to the perception of truth, there is flame without smoke: finally when through charity there is perfect possession of truth, and when there is nothing more to be sought for, the soul reposes in love, truth and tranquillity. Then there is fire without smoke or flame".<sup>4</sup>

Tranquil rest in the fire of divine love, the purpose and aim of all who seek perfection, is the last stage in the progress of the mystic, the stage of contemplation. As Richard describes it: "the third stage of love is when the soul of man is rapt into the abyss of divine light, so that utterly oblivious of exterior things, it knows not itself and passes completely into its God. In this state carnal desire is stilled and checked, and there is in the soul the silence as of midnight. And while the mind is torn from itself, while it is rapt into the very centre of the arcana of divinity, while it is shot through, penetrated and inflamed with the fire of divine love, it casts off self, puts on something of the divine, and configured to supernatural beauty, it passes into a new order of glory."<sup>5</sup>

This condition of ecstasy was not enjoyed by all who passed on to the stage of contemplation. All contemplation was not ecstasy, nor was it always complete union with God. The Victorines do not seem to be quite in agreement as to what takes place during contemplation. It would seem that during this stage the soul busies itself, partially at least, with precisely the same experiences, it had in the preceding stages of thought and meditation. Hugh enumerates first the stage of meditation, which is the necessary preliminary to contemplation, but not necessarily followed by contemplation. From meditation the soul passes on to the next stage, that of soliloquy, or the first true step in contemplation, during which a man scrutinizes the secrets of his own heart, takes account of the condition of his soul and his conscience, and then, having acquired a certain amount of self-knowledge, he is brought to recog-

<sup>4</sup> *In Ecclesiasten, Homilia, 1*, Migne, P. L. CLXXV, 117.

<sup>5</sup> *De IV Gradibus Violentae Charitatis*, Migne, P. L. CXCVI, p. 1220.

nise his own weakness and insufficiency, and is thus brought to throw himself on the divine assistance. The next stage in contemplation is circumspection, during which the seeker after perfection examines his soul in its relation to the external world, and is led to see the vanity and nothingness of things earthly, and thus conducted to the next stage of flight, or the ascent of the soul towards spiritual heights and things immaterial.

When the soul has passed through these stages, when it has become conscious of its weakness, when it is convinced of the vanity of the world, and when it has sought relief in flight towards the heavenly and spiritual, it has reached the last stage, that of pure contemplation. In perfect contemplation the soul is intent on God alone, but even here there are differences in the manner in which the soul contemplates the divine nature and the divine perfections. The soul may conceive of God by regarding the manner in which He reveals Himself in His creatures, or with regard to the way in which He is mirrored in the soul itself, or again in regard to the divine attributes, and passing on from this stage the soul may contemplate the divine essence, and thus be led on to the highest stage of contemplation, the vision of God Himself.

Richard's description of contemplation, while agreeing in the main with that of Hugh, has nevertheless certain special characteristics which represent successive stages in sanctification, and which in a sense embrace the entire spiritual life.

In brief these six progressive stages are as follows: the first is meditation, or contemplation of corporeal things; the second is that in which the cause and order of corporeal things become manifest, and in which the underlying divine plan of the universe is revealed, and in which the soul, through symbolical interpretation, passes from natural things to the consideration of immaterial and spiritual realities. The next stage is achieved when the soul reaches the realm of incorporeal substance, the region of the soul itself and of the angelic spirits. According to Richard these are preliminary or preparatory stages. "In the first two stages", he says, "we are led to a knowledge of outward and corporeal things. In the two following we reach the truth regarding invisible and spiritual things, and in the last two we are raised to the perception of super-celestial and divine things."<sup>6</sup> It is in these last two stages, especially, that mystical contemplation takes place. "The soul", Richard says, "when raised to these supreme heights of contemplation,

---

<sup>6</sup> *Benjamin Major*, lib. IV, cap. V, Migne, P. L. CXCVI, p. 138.



knows through the revelation of divine love truths, such as those regarding the trinity of persons in God, which reason can neither discover nor understand."<sup>7</sup>

Richard is preëminently the mystic of contemplation and ecstasy. He has discussed this feature of the contemplative life more fully and with more definiteness than any of his colleagues, but he is insistent on the necessity of a long period of preparation in order to attain to this stage of spiritual perfection and experience. "To my mind", he says, "if any one desires to attain to contemplation, compunction is more necessary than deep study, sighs more than syllogisms, and frequent groans more than learned arguments. For we know that nothing so thoroughly purges the heart, nothing so fully cleanses the mind, nothing more fully or more quickly restores the peace of the soul, than true repentance and compunction. What, in fact, does the Scripture say? 'Blessed are the clean of heart for they shall see God.' Let him, therefore, who seeks to see God, and to attain to the contemplation of divine things, strive to cleanse his heart."<sup>8</sup>

The contemplation of divine things to which Richard believed the soul might rise, was nothing less than the vision of God, and the complete absorption of the soul in the glory and effulgence of the divine essence. In this stage of contemplation the soul is in ecstasy, it receives the divine light in revelation and inspiration, and in the words of Richard, when the soul has reached these heights, "when through ecstasy we are rapt up to the contemplation of divine things, immediately we lose all recollection not only of all that is without, but of all that is within us. And when from that sublime state we return to ourselves, we are unable to recall that which when outside ourselves we perceived with clearness and in truth."<sup>9</sup> In ecstasy, therefore, the soul is outside itself to the extent of forgetting not only outward things, but also that which is passing within during this supernatural experience.

Supreme contemplation, rapture, mystical ecstasy, traditionally and universally represent the culmination of all mystical striving. In the works of no writers on the subject of mysticism do we find this difficult phase of the subject discussed with more definiteness and detail than in those of the School of Saint Victor. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that their exposition of the subject

<sup>7</sup> *Benjamin Major*, lib. IV, Migne, P. L. CXCVI, pp. 135, 136.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, lib. IV, cap. VI, Migne, P. L. CXCVI, p. 139.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, lib. I, cap. VI, lib. IV, cap. II, V, Migne, *ibid*.

challenges comparison with the highest thought on the matter in any language or at any time. But if ecstasy and the immediate vision of God are the culmination of mystical striving, they are also the criterion of the validity of mystical claims and assumptions. The claims of the writers of the school of St. Victor were soon challenged, and they have to bear the reproach among modern commentators of the history of thought and philosophy of having given, through their theories of mystical union with God, an impulse to the rise of pantheistic theories among some of their successors. Here we shall leave them because a discussion of the validity of their theories and their system would involve an examination of the entire basis of mysticism, and such an investigation would be irrelevant. The tendency towards mysticism was, if anything, not quite so marked in the time of Hugh and of Richard of St. Victor as it is in our own, and for this reason they, though of another time and another civilization, may still have a message for many of our own age and for many in our own country.

## JOHN DURY, ADVOCATE OF CHRISTIAN REUNION

J. M. BATTEN

Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tenn.

Richard Baxter correctly described the seventeenth century as a "contentious, dividing Age".<sup>1</sup> Divisive tendencies had been dominant in the preceding century. But the Protestant leaders in the Age of the Reformation had generally maintained that there was but one universal church. Their protests against Roman Catholic abuses and the consequent counter-charges of a revived Roman Catholicism produced the cleavage of Western Christendom and broke the formal unity of the church. Despite the inevitable differences of opinion which emerged amid the storm and stress of the time, the Protestant leaders often expressed their interest in the promotion of the visible unity of the church and they shared a common hope for the ultimate establishment of a new catholicity expressed in terms of universal free communion in place of the old Catholicism under the headship of the pope. But tendencies which the reformers failed to curb soon produced a succession of divisions. The separatists from Rome showed a marked inclination to form separate communions which, at first, followed territorial and national lines. Due to territorial, national, personal, political, and theological differences, the lines of demarcation between the groups into which Christendom was being divided gradually became defined with more pronounced clearness. In the latter part of the sixteenth century new lines of cleavage appeared. The development of rigid types of Protestant scholasticism intensified the strife over confessional differences and the Wars of Religion increased the hatreds of the age.

These characteristic developments of the sixteenth century appeared with new force in the church life of the seventeenth century. Centrifugal tendencies limited the interest in the corporate unity of the churches and threatened to destroy all unity of spirit and purpose among Christians. Thus the strife between Protestants and Roman Catholics became more bitter as the Thirty Years' War drew out its long and weary course. Discord was rife

---

<sup>1</sup> *Universal Concord* (1660), title page.

among Protestants as the century opened. The relations between the Lutheran and Reformed churches became more hostile as the Reformed churches made steady encroachments upon Lutheran territory. The Erastian policies of temporal rulers served to stir up discord among Christians of principalities and nations. The national churches of Sweden, England, Scotland and Holland were torn by internal conflict of parties. Strife over matters of doctrine, polity, and worship, and the consequent emergence of new religious denominations are characteristic features of the church life of the seventeenth century.

Historians have presented ample proof of the confusion and dissension among the churches in this age of discord, but they have failed to give proper recognition to the numerous, extensive and significant movements in the interest of Christian reunion in the seventeenth century. To understand the actual church life of the period one must realize that amid all the strife of parties there were frequent efforts to heal the divisions of Christendom. Irenic leaders, men who dared to row against the prevailing current of the times, emerged and advocated various types of union projects such as the union of groups of Protestants, the union of all Protestants, and the union of Protestants and Roman Catholics. In every decade of the seventeenth century there were significant negotiations directed toward the establishment of intercommunion, the settlement of the peace of the churches, and the advancement of the cause of Christian reunion. In each decade there appeared one or more books designed to advance peace and unity among the churches. Many of these books deserve consideration in the history of Christian irenics and they furnish vital suggestions which may be of service in the present day movement toward reunion. The list of distinguished irenic leaders of the century includes the names of Pareus, John Forbes of Corse, Davenant, Comenius, William Forbes, Calixtus, Dury, Usher, Owen, Baxter, Stillingfleet, Grotius, Matthiae, Spinola, Leibnitz, Bossuet, and Spener.<sup>2</sup>

John Dury occupies a unique position among these irenic leaders. For fifty-two years, with unwearied zeal, he devoted his life to efforts designed to establish peace and unity between contending groups of Christians. In the duration and the extent of

---

<sup>2</sup> Scholarly monographs on the reunion activities of some of these irenic leaders have been prepared; as Hans Friedrich, *Georg Calixtus, der Unionsmann des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Anklam, 1891); Matthew Spinka, *The Irenic Program and Activity of John Amos Comenius* (Typed Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1923); and, G. J. Jordan, *The Reunion of the Churches, A Study of G. W. Leibnitz and His Great Attempt*, (London, 1927).

his labors his career is without a parallel in the whole history of Christian irenics. Certainly the range of his union activities was broader than that of any of his contemporaries. He presented overtures of peace in an effort to settle each of the major religious controversies of his age. In fact, he is the only irenic leader who attempted a settlement of each of the eight major types of ecclesiastical controversy which prevailed at the time, viz.—the alignment of Protestants against Roman Catholics; of Lutherans who accepted the Formula of Concord against the Lutherans who rejected it; of Lutherans against Calvinists; of Arminians against Calvinists; of Anglicans against Scottish Presbyterians; of Puritans against High Church Anglicans; of Anglicans against Separatists; and, the alignment of English Presbyterians against English Independents.

Ample materials are available for the construction of the biography of Dury. Over eighty of his printed works have been preserved. These works range in size from brief pamphlets and memorials to extensive volumes. Hundreds of Dury's letters are summarized in the *English Calendar of State Papers* and in the *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*. The writings of his contemporaries abound in references to his reunion activities. Hitherto little attention has been paid to the biography of this irenic leader. Two theses which treat limited periods of his activity on the Continent were prepared by German students in the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup> An unsatisfactory account of his educational interests was published by H. J. Scougal in 1905.<sup>4</sup> With the exception of a scholarly monograph by Karl Brauer on Dury's mission to the Continent under Cromwell,<sup>5</sup> the printed accounts of his reunion activities have been limited to scattered references in church and secular histories and to brief articles which in many cases indicate that their authors have failed to make full use of the more important source materials which are available in the writings of Dury.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> G. H. Arnold, *Historia Johannis Duraei* (Wittenberg, 1716); and, G. J. Benzeliuss, *Dissertatio de Johanne Duraeo pacificatore celeberrimo maxime de actis eius Suecanis* (Helmstadt, 1744).

<sup>4</sup> H. J. Scougal, *Die pädagogischen Schriften John Durys, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Pädagogik* (Jena, 1905).

<sup>5</sup> Karl Brauer, *Die Unionstätigkeit John Duries unter dem Protektorat Cromwells* (Marburg, 1907).

<sup>6</sup> A detailed account of Dury's life and union activities, based on source materials, has been prepared by the present writer under the title, *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Typed Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1930).



Dury was born in Edinburgh in the year 1596. The circumstances of his early life provided excellent preparation for his later career. His youth was spent in Holland where he had unusual opportunities for contact with representatives of the most varied types of theological opinion. After years of training in the University of Leyden, at the French Huguenot Academy of Sedan, and at Oxford, he received Presbyterian ordination and began his ministerial career by accepting the pastorate of a congregation of Scottish and English settlers who were connected with the English factory of Merchant Adventurers in the city of Elbing in West Prussia. Here Dury formed a friendship with Samuel Hartlib and this friendship brought him in contact with the ideas and principles which were stressed by the Andreae-Comenius-Hartlib group. The influence of members of this group later served to arouse Dury's interest in programs for educational reform and gave definite direction to a number of his irenic projects. Residence at Elbing enabled him to see the devastating effects of religious and civil strife in Germany. Under the persuasion of Caspar Gode-mann, a Swedish Privy Councillor, Dury decided to devote his life to the advocacy of Christian reunion. In 1628 he began his efforts to establish what he called "an ecclesiastical pacification". For two years he labored to conciliate and unite the Lutheran and Calvinist churches in the district about Elbing, attempting to unite the Christians in each locality along lines which strikingly foreshadow the modern community church idea.

Encouraged by Godemann, Oxenstierna and Sir Thomas Roe, Dury decided to enlarge the scope of his union efforts. From 1630 until 1634 he devoted himself to continual negotiations in the interest of the union of the Lutheran and Calvinist churches of Germany. He hoped that the consolidation of German Protestantism would save the churches which were threatened with destruction under the drastic terms of the Edict of Restitution. He sought to enlist the coöperation of leaders of church and state in England, Holland and Sweden in an attempt to unite the Protestant churches of Germany. The English Puritans regarded his scheme with favor, but Archbishop Laud refused to offer the services of the Anglican Church as a mediator between contending groups of German Protestants. Even Dury's acceptance of re-ordination at the hands of an Anglican bishop failed to win the expected support from Laud. However, German Lutherans and Calvinists indicated a decided interest in the establishment of religious peace, notably in the Leipzig Colloquy of 1630 and in the Convention

of the Protestant Estates at Frankfort in 1634. Gustavus Adolphus cordially endorsed the project for the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Germany and it is conceivable that Dury's program might have been brought to successful realization if the death of the Swedish king had not deprived the movement of its ablest patron.

From 1635 to 1641 Dury devoted his entire time to what he described as "travel in the work of peace among the churches". These years were spent in a constant round of negotiations and conferences with leaders of church and state in England, Scotland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany. In these conferences he sought to persuade the Protestant leaders of Europe to cooperate in efforts designed to adjust quarrels between contending local groups, to establish inter-communion between the various Protestant churches, to consolidate the churches of each country into a single national church, and to combine the national churches of Christendom into a federal union.

From 1641 to 1649 Dury made numerous efforts to establish peace between contending groups in England and Scotland. On the eve of the outbreak of the civil wars, this zealous peace-maker attempted to persuade Laud, Charles I, the Covenanters, the Puritans, and the Cavaliers to forget their differences and to unite in championing the interests of Continental Protestantism which was threatened with destruction by the rising tide of the Roman Catholic Reaction. In three remarkable pamphlets, issued in 1641, he undertook to persuade king and people to reconcile their differences and unite in the championship of the Protestant interest by adopting a policy which possessed the characteristic features of the foreign policy which was later adopted by Cromwell.<sup>7</sup> During the civil wars Dury constantly spoke and wrote in the interests of peace. When the Solemn League and Covenant was adopted, he prepared pamphlets which were intended to secure recognition for the Covenant as a pledge of peace and unity. He served as a member of the Westminster Assembly where he labored in vain in an attempt to secure the union of conflicting parties on a basis of comprehension. Among the Westminster divines Dury was the outstanding advocate of the Covenant Theology and it is probable that he was partly responsible for the emphasis

<sup>7</sup> *A Summary Discourse concerning the work of Peace Ecclesiasticall, How it may concurre with the aim of a civill confederation amongst Protestants* (Cambridge, 1641); *Motives to Induce the Protestant Princes To Mind the worke of peace Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1641); and, *A Memorall Concerning Peace Ecclesiasticall Amongst Protestants* (London, 1641).

upon the Covenant theology which appears in the Westminster standards. When Dury's irenic proposals were rejected by the Assembly, he wrote a series of pamphlets in which he advocated the union of Presbyterians and Independents on a basis of compromise and comprehension. When Charles I was placed on trial, Dury sought to save him from the scaffold by furnishing him with a brief for use in conducting his defense.

After the death of Charles I, Dury was convinced that the loyal acceptance of the Commonwealth was the only way of saving England from anarchy. From 1649 to 1660 he was in the service of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. He was, next to Milton, the most ardent literary champion of the new government, especially in the days of the militant opposition to the Engagement. He continued to plead for the settlement of religious peace among the churches of England and used every opportunity to exhort Cromwell to take a position of leadership in a movement toward the reunion of all Protestant churches. By the year 1654 he had gained the confidence and support of Cromwell. The Protector sent Dury as his messenger to the churches of the Continent, notably those of Switzerland and Germany, charging him to give assurance of Cromwell's intention to champion the Protestant interest at all hazards and directing him to lay the foundations for a world-wide program of coöperation and federation among Protestant churches. The death of Cromwell thwarted the progress of this program.

After the Restoration, Dury was in disfavor in England. The later years of his life, 1660-1680, were devoted to the conduct of a constant round of reunion negotiations on the Continent. He was able to arouse considerable interest in his proposals among the churches of Holland, Switzerland and in Germany, especially in Brandenburg and Hesse. In this period he published a number of books and pamphlets in which he gave expression to his more mature reflections on the subject of the reunion of the churches. In these later writings he enlarged the scope of his irenic program and advocated the union of Protestants and Roman Catholics. Dury died at Cassell in the year 1680.

The conduct of these extensive reunion negotiations necessitated almost constant travel through the Protestant countries of Europe. No churchman of the seventeenth century had better opportunity to observe the condition of the churches. Dury's letters and pamphlets furnish a hitherto unworked mine of information regarding the history of the relationships between the churches

and the history of European diplomacy. He conducted his reunion negotiations chiefly through the medium of personal conferences with individual leaders and groups of leaders. It was his habit to make a careful record of each of these conferences.

A study of these records indicates that there were few important contemporaries whom Dury did not approach in his efforts to solicit support in behalf of his various union schemes. Rulers, churchmen, statesmen, and leaders in the fields of science and literature pass in review in his writings and their views on the subject of Christian reunion are carefully recorded. Thus we have records of his negotiations with rulers and statesmen such as Charles I, Charles II, Oliver Cromwell, Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, William Penn, Sir Thomas Roe, Hugo Grotius, the Stadtholder Frederick Henry of Orange, Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, Christian IV, King of Denmark, the Landgrave William VI of Hesse-Cassel, and, Frederick William, the Great Elector. He also prepared records of his negotiations with leading churchmen of the age, including James Usher, Primate of Ireland, Archbishops Abbot, Laud, and Juxon, the English bishops Davenant, Hall, Morton, and Bedell, the Puritan divines White of Dorchester, Joseph Mede, and Richard Sibbes, the English Presbyterian Richard Baxter, the Independent leaders Burroughs and Goodwin, the New England divines Norton and Davenport, the Scottish Covenanter Alexander Henderson, William Forbes and the other Aberdeen doctors, Comenius, John Matthiae, the outstanding irenic leader among the Swedish clergy, and the German divines John Valentine Andreae, George Calixtus, John Bergius, and Philip Jakob Spener. He was also in contact with leaders in the scientific, literary and philosophical fields such as Descartes, Milton, Samuel Hartlib, Henry Oldenburg, the first secretary of the Royal Society, John Pell, the mathematician, and Robert Boyle, the chemist. Moreover, Dury addressed memorials and petitions to many of the most important deliberative and legislative bodies of church and state in all the Protestant countries of Europe, including the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the English Parliament, the Swedish Riksdag, the convention of the Protestant Estates of the Empire, the English Convocation, the Synods of the Dutch Reformed churches, the faculties of various universities, and other groups too numerous to mention. The replies to his proposals which were furnished by individuals and by civil and ecclesiastical assemblies furnish the most important available indices of the views on the subject of Christian reunion

which were prevalent in the seventeenth century. These replies usually indicate a genuine interest in the movement toward peace and unity, but they also reflect the clear realization that the prevailing tendencies toward division and strife were too strong to be curbed effectively at the time.

Dury made free use of the irenic methods, measures, and literature which had been originated by his predecessors and contemporaries. He also developed and advocated many new proposals which were designed to advance the peace of the churches. Many of the plans which he drafted and negotiations which he conducted distinctly foreshadowed types of irenic effort which are being used successfully in the present day movement toward reunion. He was especially interested in efforts to consolidate the activities of contemporary irenic leaders and to apply the combined force of their efforts in the solution of the problems of doctrine, discipline, and worship which divided the churches of Christendom. His appeals to all the churches sounded the call for Christians everywhere to make the Communion of the Saints a vital reality rather than a pious platitude professed in the creeds. Wherever he found conflict among Christians, there he labored earnestly to persuade men to motivate themselves by love instead of hatred and to substitute the spirit of coöperation in place of the spirit of contention.

In the course of his negotiations he suited his methods and program to meet the needs of the hour. With varying degrees of emphasis, he labored to settle the peace of contending churches by the use of such methods as conference, coöperation, comprehension, and arbitration. He believed that the ultimate settlement of the peace of Christendom could be established by means of a graduated series of representative councils, which were to adjust differences in local, territorial, and national areas and finally culminate in a universal conference on Christian faith, order, and duty. Although Dury devoted much of his time and energy to the settlement of local quarrels, it is clear that he always looked toward the ultimate objective of establishing peace between contending Christians and churches of each nation with the hope that the Christians of each nation might be united in a single national church and that the national churches of Christendom might be combined in a federal union. Earlier advocates of conciliarism probably influenced Dury's ideas as to the proper mode of government for a united church, but he apparently makes no acknowledgment of his indebtedness to them. He proposed that the churches of Christendom



should be ruled by means of a gradated series of representative assemblies, with a General Council, meeting at stated intervals, and with standing committees to promote Christian communion and coöperation in the intervals between the meetings of General Councils.

Dury worked for years to secure the preparation of a common confession of faith which would combine and harmonize the essential teachings regarding matters of faith and duty which were contained in all the existing confessions. Sharing the current interest in the Covenant Theology, he frequently suggested that the Covenant idea should be used as the basic principle in the formation of this new consensus of religious beliefs. Deploring the divisive tendencies which arose out of the development of rigid types of Protestant scholasticism, he sought to shift the attention of theologians from debates over confessional differences to an interest in the development of "practical divinity" as a theological discipline of primary importance. In company with other precursors of German Pietism, he consistently maintained the thesis that Christianity should be regarded as a way of life rather than an attitude of intellectual assent to a given body of dogma. Impressed with the value of emphasis upon subjective religious experience, he was one of the chief agents in the interchange of ideas between the leading exponents of practical mysticism in England and Germany.

Believing that contending Christian groups would forget their differences if they could be persuaded to work together in the conduct of constructive projects, Dury encouraged inter-church coöperation in missionary and educational enterprises. He was one of the most ardent advocates of Protestant missionary activity in the seventeenth century. He followed the leadership of John Amos Comenius in advocating educational reform as an effective method of promoting Christian reunion. He made numerous and important attempts to persuade the leaders of church and state in England to coöperate in the establishment of an improved, uniform, and universal system of popular education. Although Dury possessed narrow views in regard to the principle of toleration, he often appeared as the champion of oppressed groups as in the case of his advocacy of the re-admission of the Jews into England and his successful effort to secure Cromwell's intervention in behalf of the persecuted Waldenses of the Piedmont.

In conclusion, it should be said that Dury's enthusiasm for the cause of Christian reunion sometimes impaired his judgment of other values. His opponents were often correct in charging that

many of his union proposals were too vague, indefinite, and impractical. In his impatient haste to hurry from the adjustment of one theological quarrel in order to make peace in another area of conflict he sometimes failed to understand the issues which were dividing Christians into contending groups. Granting these and other valid criticisms, the fact remains that Dury was the most zealous and consistent advocate of the union of the churches in the seventeenth century. His efforts were for the most part unsuccessful. All of his major union proposals were rejected. The "contentious, dividing Age" in which he lived was unwilling to accept the peace proposals of this genial Scotsman. Yet Dury often helped to soothe the bitter partisan hatred of his day. Christians of the twentieth century manifest an increasing interest in the cause to which he consecrated his life. Union advocates of to-day may profit by the study of his irenic program and activities. Certainly the numerous expressions of vital interest in the cause of Christian reunion, which were occasioned by his negotiations, indicate a desire for the establishment of peace and unity among the churches which has received too scanty recognition in most accounts of seventeenth century church history.

## AMONG THE MEMBERS

Professor Raymond W. Albright, of the Department of Church History in the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Reading, Pa., has completed a *History of Religious Education in the Evangelical Church*. In this work he was assisted by the Reverend R. B. Leedy of Gibsonburg, Ohio. Professor Albright is also preparing a comprehensive history of the Evangelical Church. He is a great-great-grandson of Jacob Albright, the founder of this church.

Reverend Frank S. Brewer, of Sheffield, Illinois, read a paper dealing with the *History of the Rock River Association, 1851-1931*, at the meeting of the Bureau-Rock River Association of Congregational Churches, in September, 1932. He also arranged an exhibit of historic mementoes.

Professor Mervin M. Deems has made a tour around the world as American Fellow on the Albert Kahn Foundation. The tour extended from June, 1931 to June, 1932. Dr. Deems spent most of the year in India, China, and Japan.

Professor P. E. Kretzmann, of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, has finished a manuscript on *The Story of the German Bible*. The work was written to commemorate the quadri-centennial of the completion of Luther's Bible. It deals with the subject from the work of Ulphilas to the most recent German translations. It will appear either in book form or as a series in the *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Professor Kretzmann is also engaged in writing a *Cyclopaedia of Persons and Places in Reformation History*.

Dr. Charles S. Macfarland has arranged with Professor Adolf Keller, of the Universities of Geneva and Zurich, to lecture at about twenty American theological seminaries on the influence of Barthianism on the church and on Christian unity, and on conditions in Europe. He is also arranging for the publication of an English translation of Dr. Keller's book.

Professor John T. McNeill of the Divinity School, University of Chicago, spent six weeks of the early summer lecturing in Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. The courses given were on "The Expansion of Christianity to Constantine" and "Christianity in the Reformation Era". The body of the students consisted of about sixty-five "Seminary teachers" of the Mormon Church, whose task is to give courses in religion to pupils at the high schools. Some others were in attendance, and all exhibited an insatiable appetite for church history.

Professor Matthew Spinka of the Chicago Theological Seminary has completed the manuscript of his book on *A History of Balkan Slavic Christianity in the Middle Ages*.

Professor W. W. Sweet of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago is spending the Autumn Quarter at Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. Besides teaching a number of church history courses, he is scheduled to deliver six special lectures on "The Makers of American Methodism."

## IN MEMORIAM

### AUSTIN BAXTER KEEP

Dr. Austin Baxter Keep, a member of the American Society of Church History for twenty years, died on August 19, 1932, at the age of fifty-seven. He had gone to the South in search of health, and died at Asheville, N. C. Born at Bloomfield, N. J., he spent his boyhood in Norwich, Conn., and was prepared for college at the Norwich Free Academy. He graduated from Amherst College in 1897. In 1911 he received the degree of Ph. D. from Columbia University. After teaching for several years in Adelphi College, Brooklyn, in 1915 he became professor of history in the College of the City of New York. From this position he retired in 1930. Dr. Keep gave particular attention to certain aspects of American colonial history, and had written and lectured in this field.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### RESEARCHES IN MANICHAISM

By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. xxviii+393 pages. \$5.00.

Without in the least disparaging Professor Jackson's other great books and studies, this work, "a sort of Prolegomena . . . for broader studies on Mānī and his religion," may well be described as the crowning achievement of his rich and studious life. Such "sort of Prolegomena" demand the most tedious and painstaking "sort of" work in order to constitute for many years to come a valuable mine whose many opened galleries provide opportunity for many to do profitable work.

A brief sketch of Manichaeism forms the opening chapter. Five Manichaean fragments in Turfan Pahlavi are thereupon presented in transliterated text and translation and studied in great and valuable detail. These are followed by two anti-Manichaean chapters from Book-Pahlavi works and by a thorough study of Theodore bar Khoni's Syriac work on Mani's teachings, in the latter of which the native knowledge of Syriac of the Reverend Abraham Yohannan, to whose memory the book is dedicated, is used with telling effect. The body of the book concludes with five monographic studies on various phases and special problems in the complicated structure of Manichaeism. The preface is followed by a full table of contents, a most useful list of abbreviations, an excellent bibliography (to December 31, 1930), and a note on transcription and pronunciation. A fine index in three parts and references to general passages cited (in eleven languages) and words (in fourteen languages) close the volume.

The sketch of Manichaeism and its history which serves as an introduction is, indeed, brief, occupying no more than eighteen pages. In addition to its brevity, it is most comprehensive, as the analysis in the table of contents shows. The survey is in the main excellent, as was to be expected, and well adapted to its introductory purpose. The existence of Mazdakism as a distinct and separate movement, as the opening sentence phrases it, can hardly be any longer maintained after the brilliant study of Arthur Christensen, *Le Règne du Roi Kawādh I et le Communisme Mazdakite*, Copenhagen, 1925. Mazdakism must now be considered as a reforming restatement of Manichaeism, founded in Rome about 300 A. D. and thence transferred to Persia not long after. The banishment of Mani from the entire kingdom of Persia, rather than from the capital, and his long and far travels in the East rather than literary activity chiefly in Syriac in lower Mesopotamia, together with extension and organization of his church there, seem now more doubtful than the statements of page 6 allow. Buddha was, indeed, considered a forerunner by Mani, but certainly before any possibility of eastward travel on his part, for he holds this opinion in his first literary effort at his initial public appearance before Shāhpuhr I in 242 A. D. That he is to be considered an actual spiritual predecessor in the same manner as Zoroaster and Jesus may well be doubted. And even the conception of Manichaeism as a composite



of Oriental Zoroastrianism and Hellenistic Christianity is scarcely tenable without addition of early Gnostic Mandaeism and the influence of at least two great figures, Marcion and Bardaisan, who are constantly mentioned in close connection with Mani by all eastern sources from Ephraim down. If it is at all possible, we should like to see this sketch revised in a new edition, as only Professor Jackson himself can revise it. Perhaps it may even be expanded into something of a monograph.

In the Pahlavi section it would be presumptuous for anyone else in America to add much to Professor Jackson's work. On the other hand, he would be the last to refuse due consideration to any serious suggestion. We venture a few in accord with our restricted space. The troublesome phrase translated at the bottom of page 177 "was maintained and made" and touched upon in note 15, page 188 may, of course, be a mere inversion by a slip of the pen; but cannot *dāšt* mean rather "held fast, kept from disintegrating immediately, from being dissipated", the fragments of Kuni's body, and then made from them this Great Creation? The brilliant discovery by Goetze of a portion of the Dāmdāt Nask, hesitatingly mentioned in note 11, on page 186, is now accepted in its major premise by Schaefer, Reitzenstein, and others. Note 34, pages 192 ff, is an important contribution to our knowledge; should not the Turkish *ygrmii* on page 195 be read "twenty" rather than "twelve"? We have room for no more, though we have barely touched the riches embodied in this book. The somewhat irritating misprints in the paging of cross-references, due, no doubt, to last minute additions or changes, will not prevent this book from becoming and remaining for many years a major source-book for American and English students of Mani and the greatest of Gnostic world religions, Manichaeism.

M. Sprengling.

The University of Chicago.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND

By W. K. JORDAN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. 490 pages. \$5.00.

The issues raised by the conflict between the interests of the individual and those of society are among the most puzzling and enduring of all political problems. Modern governments are in constant doubt as to the amount of hostile agitation which they will permit. In the years when the maintenance of some variety of religion was considered an essential function of the existing government the guise under which the ever-present problem presented itself was that of religious toleration. The tracing of the development of ideas and practise concerning this subject is therefore a work which should interest both the historian and the political scientist.

Mr. Jordan, who is an instructor in history in Harvard University, has taken for his share in this task the Tudor period, as is indicated by the subtitle of the book, *From the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth*. A preliminary chapter takes us to 1558 and the remaining sections are devoted to descriptions of the attitudes

during the Elizabethan period of such groups as the government and the Anglicans, the Puritans, Separatists, laymen, and Roman Catholics. While the author's conclusions only serve to confirm the general impressions given by the works of such men as J. N. Figgis, J. W. Allen, and A. J. Klein, he has done his work in much greater detail and with commendable thoroughness. A generally successful attempt is made to summarize both the thought and the legislation on this subject. The bibliography is lengthy and detailed, giving evidence of much labor, both in English and Continental libraries. The book satisfies a real need, and will easily become the standard work in the field.

In such a good book it is unfortunate that the problem of organization should prove so difficult. 1569 or 1570 would seem to mark a more decisive turning point in the development of governmental policy than 1576, which seems to be chosen rather arbitrarily as a dividing line for the two chapters on this topic. Although given a somewhat reasonable defense, the assignment of a separate chapter to lay writers has the disadvantage of lumping together Acontius and Sir Edwin Sandys, rather than allowing them to be treated in connection with their respective teachers, the Anabaptists and Richard Hooker. The final chapter on Roman Catholic thought contains a summary of the medieval as well as the Elizabethan position, while many of the necessary connecting links are in the first chapter. Rather than building it on organizations, men, and books, perhaps it would have been better to center a work on political theory around ideas and thus trace the development of each of the three great schools of thought on this subject, the Roman Catholic (including the strict Presbyterian Puritan), the Anglican, and the Anabaptist (including the Separatists).

The author's Anglican sympathies cause him to do rather less than justice to some of the other groups considered. When he comes across a Puritan who speaks mildly on his topic he feels that he must have drunk deeply at Hooker's moderate spring. But not all Puritans were as intolerant as those leaders whom he discusses. Richard Greenham, for example, was one exception, and it is a bit disappointing to find no mention of the works of such an influential Elizabethan Puritan thinker as William Perkins, though he was of the sterner sort. On the other hand the author may be pleased with the suggestion that the strict Bishop Pilkington whom he feels constrained to accept as an Anglican belonged to that group of Puritans who in the early days of Elizabeth were given high ecclesiastical preferments and strangely enough accepted them in spite of their leanings toward Geneva.

Like some other English historians, including the present reviewer, Dr. Jordan encounters some difficulties when he crosses the channel in search of background material. Professor Bainton of Yale has kindly called my attention to two slips in the section dealing with the early life and associations of Acontius. On page 315 the author regrets the loss of the works of a certain "Clebergius." This title was the pseudonym adopted by one of the contributors to the *De Haereticis* attributed to Castellion as editor, and his contribution may be found on page 125 of the 1554 edition (French translation, *Traité des Hérétiques*, (Geneva, 1913) p. 142). On pages 308-9 he suggests the existence of an unpublished apology for Servetus written by a friend of Acontius named Curio. The Basle manuscript

apology of which Curio is suggested as the author by Buisson (*Sébastien Castellion*, (Paris 1892) II, 9) and Ruffini (*La Liberta Religiosa*, (Torino 1901) p. 81) is published in the *Opera Calvini* (Brunswick ed.) XV, No. 1918, pp. 52-63. Dr. Karl Roth of the Basler Universitätsbibliothek rejects the ascription to Curio.

We cannot but feel that the problem of religious toleration was solved more by the discovery that uniformity in this regard was not essential to the existence of a well-ordered society than by any constructive suggestions as to the rights of individuals. Nevertheless this work may well serve to stimulate the minds of those who would to-day approach the knotty problem of preserving these rights in the face of the claims of the sovereign state.

M. M. Knappen.

The University of Chicago.

#### HILDEBRANDINE STUDIES

*The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII*, translated with an introduction by EPHRAIM EMERTON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. xxxi+212 pages, \$3.50.

*Hildebrandine Essays*, by J. P. WHITNEY, D. D. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. viii+184 pages, \$2.80.

In the two works under review we have the fruits of two long careers in the field of church history. Professor Emerton is over eighty and Professor Whitney over seventy-five years of age. Both have lived through what might be called the New Investiture Strife, in the process of which the modern view of their common hero has been changed fundamentally. An element of diffidence and respect in the reviewer may therefore be pardonable. Professor Emerton's work is a translation of selected letters from the *Registrum* of Gregory VII, prefaced by an adequate introduction, and followed by a bibliography of the main works on the subject. Professor Whitney's book, as its title states, comprises five essays, whose appearance ranges from 1910 to the present time. Each essay possesses a select bibliography of the more important works on the subject, supplemented by copious footnotes in which modern works and discussions play a great part. Professor Whitney's comments on the place of these works in the controversy are not the least valuable part of his work. They enable the reader to judge with some certainty the relation of the various contributors to the whole subject. The effect of the converging opinions of scholars in several fields and approaching the subject from a variety of angles gives some degree of confidence that at last the historical Gregory has emerged from the mass of heroic legend which surrounded his name. One instance will suffice—the Gregory who founded "Gregorianism" is a myth. The ancestor of the "Gregorian ideal" is Cardinal Humbert, whose policy was directly opposed alike to that of Hildebrand and to that of Peter Damiani.

Both writers deal with the chaos of the times and the efforts to reform, which was by no means confined to Cluny, as the career of Burchard

of Worms shows. The basis of reform is the Forged Decretals, and Professor Whitney, rightly we think, accepts the position of Fournier that their *fons et origo* was the metropolitan see of Tours. Professor Whitney also gives a useful sketch of the history of the *pallium*, which was one of the instruments of papal centralization. He is successful in exploding the myth that originally no confession of faith was necessary to its bestowal and that the (later) oath of allegiance to Saint Peter was the sole *sine qua non* of acceptance. He might have added one instance of its use which aroused a sharp controversy between Nicholas I and Hincmar, when the former rebuked the latter for wearing it every day, laying the cause to pride. This is significant, as Dr. Previté Orton once suggested to the reviewer, that Hincmar's object was to build up on Rheims a Teutonic Patriarchate, and he may well have conceived that the grant of metropolitan authority was final, even to the exclusion of further interference from Rome. Pseudo-Isidore's 'declaration of episcopal rights' seems to have produced an equal and opposite declaration of metropolitans' right.

Both works deal adequately with the legend of the mighty and imperious Hildebrand, and readers of the one may easily turn to the translation of the letters in the other, for Professor Emerton has wisely included the *Registrum* reference in his translation. The *Registrum* is the key to the whole change in the attitude towards Gregory VII. The letter book reveals a picture so different from that of Lampert of Hersfeld that it was at first greeted by the designation of another mediaeval forgery, but the work of Jaffé, Giesebrecht, Bernheim and his pupils, Peitz and Caspar (most admirably summarized in both these works), combined with Holder-Egger's deadly criticism of Lampert's narrative, has left the field clear to them.

The new Hildebrand is a person of not a little modesty, almost overwhelmed by the prospect of the responsibilities of his office; like his great predecessor Gregory the Great, a monk at heart and by vows dragged into secular office by the demands of the hour and by his own signal competence to handle the situation. Lane Poole's position that Gregory VII's title owed nothing to the first Gregory and all to Gregory VI appears to go too far. It may well have been that Gregory VI took the title from the similarity of the situation to that of his canonized predecessor. The flood was a flood of simony and the pestilence, a pestilence of sexual irregularity, and despite the efforts of the Popes and their archdeacon and successor Hildebrand, ably seconded by Peter Damiani, the situation had not changed materially.

Both works pay proper attention to the force of *Iustitia* in the career of Hildebrand and to his conservative policy in attempting to retain the working of both aspects of the *Respublica Christiana*—the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium*. It was only when the *imperium* failed that the *sacerdotium* was compelled to take the matter into its own hands. That was the policy of Cardinal Humbert all along, but Professor Whitney shows conclusively that he was in constant opposition to the more restrained efforts of Hildebrand and Peter Damiani.

One essay in Professor Whitney's book calls for special notice—his delightful sketch of Peter Damiani, the representative of the dying ideal in contrast with Humbert, the prophet of the new era. His treatment

shows an affection for the man who rose from swineherd to Cardinal and never forgot the lessons of charity which his early adversity taught him. The essay, too, on Berengar of Tours fills a real need and serves the writer's purpose well in giving him an opportunity to show his insight into parochial affairs, official and personal rivalries, and the wise handling of a delicate situation by Hildebrand.

Professor Emerton's translation of the letters is faithful and shows far more patience and finish than his modest preface claims. If one might suggest an improvement to the arrangement, he might have followed Mirbt's example of adding to each letter, which called for such comment, a reference to the main work or works on the subject, but the two works under review can be used side by side. It is strange, however, that Professor Emerton should have omitted from his bibliography the work of Dr. Z. N. Brooke in the *Cambridge Medieval History* Vol. V and elsewhere, as it is the most convenient and up-to-date presentation in English, at least, and holds its own with any of the other work on the subject. In conclusion, the excellent index which each work contains calls for special comment.

F. W. Buckler.

The Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, O.

#### HILDEBRAND

By A. J. MACDONALD. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1932. ix+246 pages. 7s 6d.

The principal purpose of the author was to correct the unsatisfactory treatment in English histories of the reign of Henry IV of Germany in its relation to the pontificate of Gregory VII. He has succeeded admirably in popularizing recent German research in this field.

Hildebrand's participation in reforming a degenerate papacy and loosening the Roman bishopric from local factional control and elevating it to a supreme universal papacy controlling the western world is very fairly evaluated. He has to his account the reorganization of the papal financial system, the enforcement of celibacy, the prohibition of simony, the prevention of lay investiture, the centralization of power in the papacy, the exaltation of the hierarchy at the expense of the civil ruler. Hildebrand greatly extended the application of the principles of the forged Donation of Constantine and he also suggested the Eastern crusades as a way to unite Christendom under the bishop of Rome.

And yet Hildebrand was a politician rather than a statesman, always ready to pick a quarrel and just as ready to drop it or postpone it when danger threatened. Philip of France, described by Hildebrand as "not content with attacks upon churches, adultery, rape, perjury, and fraud etc.", might just as well have been the object of his wrath as Henry IV. Gregory VII was an enthusiast rather than a far-seeing pope who, when arranging to place himself and two women at the head of the Eastern crusade, was ready to appoint Henry IV head of the church! Hildebrand drifted into the quarrel with Henry IV. Canossa was a great victory for Henry, not for the pope, who by the king's penitence was prevented from crossing the Alps and appearing at Augsburg. Indeed,



Henry IV was crowned emperor by pope Clement III in 1084, after Gregory VII had been deposed and excommunicated. Hildebrand died in exile with Rome in ashes through the intervention of Guiscard; Henry was victorious in Germany.

Thus the "diplomacy" of Hildebrand merely brought on "the devastating war between Papacy and Empire, which set back the civilization of Europe for five hundred years."

A couple of typographical errors escaped the careful proof reader: *consequens*, p. 34; *tithe-prayers*, p. 132.

Conrad Henry Moehlman.

Rochester-Colgate Theological Seminary.

#### NICHOLAS OF CUSA

By HENRY BETT. London: Methuen & Co., 1932. 210 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

A number of books of a recently conceived *Mediaeval Churchmen Series* have been published, of which the present volume ranks as one of the best. Men like St. Francis and Hildebrand have received considerable attention at the hands of English historians, but Cusa has been quite inaccessible to those who must depend upon the English language. None of the chief biographies, those of Scharpff, Duex, Rotta, and Vansteenberghe have been translated into English, while Cusa's own monumental works, the editions of 1490, 1514, and 1565 are in Latin. The present volume, consequently, fills a real gap. It is divided into three parts, the first dealing with Cusa's life, the second with his writings, and the third with his philosophy.

The biographical sketch is based not only upon the standard lives but also upon the author's own research, of which numerous references give evidence. It is sympathetic in its approach, *en rapport* with the intellectual climate of the period, yet critical in its judgments and fair in its appraisals. Cusa is realistically set forth over against the background of the churchly and humanistic atmosphere of the fifteenth century and is usually given the benefit of the doubt in those delicate situations where students often have passed disparaging judgments upon him. In most of these the reviewer is inclined to agree with the author. For instance, Cusa's remarkable change of front from Conciliarist to Papalist is fully explained without having recourse to the charge of bribery. This book is no eulogy, however, for blots in Cusa's character ("a scandalous pluralist") as well as defects in his system of thought are readily acknowledged.

The most significant of Cusa's writings are listed in their chronological order of appearance and briefly discussed. In this connection it may be of interest to note that in one of the Cardinal's fanciful speculations upon cycles of ages he concluded that the Second Advent would occur in the first part of the eighteenth century, the time actually designated by Swedenborg.

As an ecclesiastical leader and a reformer Cusa perhaps has received adequate recognition, but not as a philosophical thinker. Only those who have studied him closely, of whom there have been exceedingly few, have given him proper credit. To this task the author devotes slightly

more than half the book. Nicholas occupies a unique place in the author's opinion in being among the first to discredit the story of the Donation of Constantine and much else in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, Valla's devastating criticism following a few years later. The former likewise voiced his suspicions regarding Pseudo-Dionysius.

Although Nicholas took his point of departure from the Neoplatonist metaphysics, he attempted to overcome its dualism with the bold suggestion of the unity of all in the theory that God and the universe were really correlative terms, one to be considered as the ultimate, the other as the derived reality. Actually, however, he merely pushed the problem farther back by positing a dualism in the very nature of God. Here he built upon Erigena and Eckhart. Cusa anticipated Descartes in his emphasis upon and his use of mathematics. In his resolution of all contraries into a higher unity he reminds one of Hegel. The author intimates that Cusa's problem and his treatment thereof were similar to those of F. H. Bradley. Indeed, his teaching regarding degrees of reality has a modern sound. One suggestion, moreover, harmonizes well with recent English philosophy, namely, that "no ultimate constituent is now intelligible except in its relation to the whole system within which it acts" (p. 159f). Again, in his cosmology Cusa was a precursor of Copernicus, Bruno, and Kepler, with a pronounced direct influence upon the latter two. In relating the empirical to the transcendental, Cusa reminds one of Kant, and in his thought of the relativity of all knowledge he anticipated modern tendencies in philosophy.

The author finds the chief defect of the Cusan philosophy in its accentuated intellectualism in the direction of Gnosticism. This was largely due to its failure to recognize love as well as knowledge as a controlling principle of religion. Cusa lived too much in the region of bloodless abstractions. And yet, his doctrine of faith and salvation comes close to the evangelical positions of the Protestant reformers. In his summary the author concludes that the concept of unity was the focal point of the whole Cusan philosophy. In the political and ecclesiastical life of the Empire as well as in the realm of thought unity was sought and found "in the superessential Unity of God" (p. 204). The book is well documented, admirably written, a scholarly production; but one misses a bibliography.

A. W. Nagler.

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

#### MYSTICISM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE ENGLISH COMMONWEALTH

By RUFUS M. JONES. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.  
xiii+184 pages. \$2.00.

Whether there is or is not a necessary connection between mysticism and democracy depends on the content given to either or both of these baffling and often irritating terms. From the point of view of mysticism as an inner unworldly, emotional, and worshipful attitude toward God, a person might be a thorough going mystic and yet have no interest whatever in democracy as a system of political organization. And from the

point of view of democracy as a theory of the state in which every individual is guaranteed an equal voice with all others in the administration of public interests, an enthusiastic democrat may be a cold-blooded unbeliever in the existence of any sort of God. But it is not in the sense which thus disconnects the concepts from each other that Dr. Rufus M. Jones uses the terms. Mysticism is to him the individual's most intimate and direct response to the inworking of the divine Spirit. Democracy is the assertion and practice of the individual's right to a share in the voice that determines the course of the community's life. Since the individual must live Godward and manward at the same time, he can not separate between his mysticism and his democracy.

History attests this at some of its critical moments. Of these the era of the English Commonwealth was one. And to the era of the English Commonwealth Dr. Jones goes to study the interplay of mysticism and democracy. What he finds here is groups of sturdy individualists inflamed by the consciousness of immediate contact with God. But they are waging an uncompromising warfare for the right of human spirits to organize themselves as equals under God. Naturally, this type of contention was not much encouraged in the high stream of history. The student must look for it in the side currents of the obscurer sects of Christians, who stood for the "self-governing church." Such were the Seekers, the Quakers, the Brownists and various others. No exhaustive list of them could be made since the principle for which they stood admitted of dissent in the smallest practically organized group of them. It is an interesting field. Yet, from the nature of it, the results that the historian obtains as a reward for his patient labor are meager. Dr. Jones has explored it with the meticulous care of a genuine historian and the glowing enthusiasm of a mystic.

To cap the climax, he assures us that his object in entering the field was something other than information for the mind. He seeks light, to be sure, but he seeks it as a help to solve problems of present day living importance. What we most need today, he thinks, is a great spiritual awakening, and in a period of spiritual fervor such as that of the English Commonwealth, we may perhaps find the secret of its presence. By presenting the exact facts and interpreting the earnestness and heroism of a generation of Spirit-filled men he hopes to quicken the pulse of the spiritual life in our day. Let us trust that his little book may realize his hope.

Andrew C. Zenos.

Chicago Presbyterian Seminary.

#### THE ITALIAN REFORMERS: 1534-1564

By FREDERIC CORSS CHURCH. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. xii+428 pages. \$5.00.

This book is what the title promises, a study of the early Italian reformers and not of the Italian Reformation. It aims at comprehensiveness, including not only theologians but all reformers, even some of the gentler sex. The treatment is very unequal, some of the lesser lights like the diplomat Maggi and the amateur Protestant D'Oria receiving more space than the real coryphees. A number of reformers find hardly more

than bare mention. All this causes a disproportionate valuation of the individual reformers.

The author gives mainly the external story of these men and women. We hear very little about their religious convictions, differences among themselves and literary works, but more about their persecutions by their co-religionists. At times we get some glimpses of their private life and read of some peccadillos or even greater infractions of the moral code.

The central figure of the book is Boniface Amerbach, the genial host and ever ready friend of these Italian exiles. Calvin, the Zwinglian rulers of Zurich and the Lutheran princes of Germany play more subordinate rôles.

About one fourth of the book is taken up with a survey of the political developments of the period under consideration. Here the author clearly overshoots the mark. Much extraneous matter is given which has no relation or a very loose one to the Italian reformers. The laudable endeavor to set every detail into its proper milieu is defeated by the confusing mass of details.

The synchronical method employed does not lend itself to clearness of presentation of historical events. The scenes of action are constantly changing and developments perpetually interrupted. Certainly this method eases the way to the introduction of new characters of whom we never know whence they came and whither they went.

The author gives us very much new information but the form is not always properly "abgerundet". However, the characterization of the persons is invariably masterful.

The author overrates the influence of Calvin, Valdes, and the humanists and underrates the influence of Luther and the Waldenses. He ignores the working of the spiritualistic tendencies of the Fraticelli which always crystallized into Protestant doctrines at most distant points when they were not repressed by force.

The Italian Reformation was a stronger movement than the author would have us believe. It grew despite the Inquisition for more than a century and was checked by the counter-reformation of Catholic preachers.

The present study is the best book on the subject we have at present. The author is serenely non-partisan to all parties concerned. With the exception of one statement regarding tyrannicide (p. 367), the Catholic scholar hardly will find anything which would hurt his feelings. The scientific and unbiassed study of Mr. Church deserves unqualified praise.

John M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.

St. Paul's Monastery, Westerville, O.

#### MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY: VOLUME II, MODERN CHURCH HISTORY: REVISED AND ENLARGED

By ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. xv+794 pages. \$2.

Continuing demand has called forth a new edition of Professor Newman's *Manual*. Volume II, the first to appear, is issued in its author's eighty-first year, and many will rejoice that he has lived to see such a success. He says in his new preface that he has found little requiring

change in the body of his work. Examination of many pages chosen at random in this volume shows no changes from the first edition of 1902 except correction of some of the few errors in dates and typography and some verbal adjustments to the new time of publication. Of the 781 pages of text, 713 are practically what they were thirty years ago. Professor Newman's work is so well known that comment on what is now re-issued seems superfluous.

The revision and enlargement consist of a new chapter in larger type entitled "Twentieth Century Supplement" and a short miscellaneous bibliographical list containing publications since 1902. The "Supplement" describes some of the most important features of the history of organized Christianity, Protestant and Roman Catholic, to 1931. The plan of the earlier part of the book, by which the narrative is divided into sections devoted to denominational groups, is followed here. Because of this the chapter is occupied chiefly with ecclesiastical affairs, including church union movements. Theological developments receive some attention. The plan does not provide for consideration of general aspects of the religious situation. The "Supplement" will not give appreciation of some of the chief tendencies of modern religious life, such as the application of Christianity to social conditions. Accepting the author's plan, one may question the selection and proportions of material at some points. When American Baptists get three pages and the Lutherans four, the Congregationalists might at least be mentioned, and the Congregational-Christian union is an achievement deserving chronicling. The missionary activities of the churches are strangely slighted. There are minor inaccuracies, and the author's pronounced theological views sometimes color his treatment. But the chapter, like the earlier part of the book, is a clearly arranged storehouse of information.

The last 19 pages deal with Russian Christianity from the sixteenth century. This ground was not covered in the first edition. Characteristically Professor Newman emphasizes the dissenting sects, giving them more space than the Orthodox Church. The book closes with a brief account of the fortunes of the Russian church since 1917.

Volume I of the revised Manual, it is promised, will soon follow.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

#### DIE NEUZEIT

By HORST STEPHAN AND HANS LEUBE. (*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. by Gustav Krüger, Vol. 4.) 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931. xii+472 pages.

The first edition of the fourth part of Krüger's handbook appeared in 1909. As one of the few histories of modern Christianity, it was the chief guide of the students of the modern period of the church. Its new, thoroughly revised edition, brought up to date with significant chapters on the post-war era, is therefore very welcome. The author of the first edition, H. Stephan, who in the meantime has become a systematic theologian, was assisted by a younger church historian, H. Leube. The two scholars seem to have coöperated most successfully: they present a uni-



fied work of great distinction. The vast mass of detail which modern historians have to scrutinize, is well organized and authoritatively and objectively discussed. The rich bibliographies, characteristic of the entire series, are not lacking in this volume. Of particular excellence are the general articles which offer surveys of developments or phases of a special local or temporal area. Much emphasis is laid upon the cultural and theological trends of modern times. It is natural that German church history has been treated with a thoroughness which sometimes seems to be out of proportion compared with the attention given the churches of other countries. One must hasten, however, to add that significant information has nowhere been omitted, and the authors deserve special thanks for the excellent chapters, unusual in foreign church histories, which they have devoted to America. They were therein partly assisted by Dr. W. W. Rockwell. The book is urgently recommended to all students of the history of the modern church.

W. Pauck.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

#### BURNED BOOKS: NEGLECTED CHAPTERS IN BRITISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE

By CHARLES RIPLEY GILLET. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. 2 volumes. Pp. xiv, 723. \$10.

Bibliographical history like this will be prized by the ecclesiastical historian. It is a positive contribution toward the solution of one of his major problems. His task is to discover and to portray Christianity as it has actually been in all of its manifestations through the ages. Merely to trace the course of its life, its evolution through internal development, and its adaptations to external influences is not sufficient. Religion and the church must also be evaluated for their real significance in the successive historic phases of the civilization in which they have constituted significant elements. They must be examined not only from within, but likewise, in perspective from without.

The student of internal history almost always finds some sort of quantitative data in his documents. Even doctrinal records include some hints for distinguishing relative values. But usually any attempt to correlate the religious elements of life with the other factors of contemporary culture is hampered by the absence of specific events. It is because of this lack of scale that so many of the histories of culture read like scrap-books of the strange, the grotesque, and the abnormal.

Dr. Gillett has chosen a subject which might easily be dismissed *a priori* as only of dilettante interest, antiquarianism rather than history. But a reading of his narrative will reveal its true value. He has produced a carefully documented record of the official condemnation and destruction of books which seemed to authority to be subversive religiously, politically, or morally. He limits his study in the main to Britain and its American colonies, and touches the pre-Reformation period only by way of introduction. He devotes as much, or more, space to books that were politically objectionable as to those condemned on theological grounds. This the church historian will welcome because it will safeguard him from

mistaking for religious rancour what was very largely only the contemporary conception of authority. But the chief value of the work will be as a demonstration of the method of bibliographical history. Books are treated seriously, not merely for their content, but as historical evidence of the culture which produced and received them. If these two volumes are examined from this point of view they will be found highly suggestive of possible applications of this bibliographical method in other fields of church history.

Pierce Butler.

University of Chicago.

#### A HISTORY OF THE WORK OF THE CISTERCIANS IN YORKSHIRE

By FRANCIS ANTHONY MULLIN. Washington: Catholic University of America. 1932. xi+131 pages. \$1.25.

Dr. Mullin introduces his subject with a simple account of the rise of the Cistercians, their spread to England, and the origins of their eight permanent houses in Yorkshire between 1131 and 1150. The piety of the early Cistercian communities is sympathetically presented in Chapter II, which draws largely upon the *Speculum Caritatis* of Ailred of Rievaulx. In Yorkshire as elsewhere Cistercian industry born of religion passed into a commercial stage, and the chief aspects of this subject are studied in Chapters III and IV, which treat respectively of the wool trade and of agriculture. The facts here marshalled will tend to correct the supposition that the wealth of the order in Yorkshire was chiefly a product of a vast and successful trade in wool. Scottish forays, sheep diseases, predatory taxation, and freakish restrictions upon the business, combined to make the raising and exportation of wool a precarious enterprise. Larger and more secure were the incomes from the soil and from cattle breeding. We are cautioned against the assumption that wide acres always represented proportionally great wealth. The manual labor of the monastic estates was at first performed by monks and lay brothers alike, but the lay brothers declined in numbers and were replaced by hired laborers. A chapter devoted to the social and educational influence of the monasteries, amid other interesting data, gives some facts on Cistercian hospitality. Travellers were not only lodged and fed but entertained by hired minstrels, fools, and players. The book is provided with a bibliography and an essay on the sources. While too statistical to be widely read, it will prove of high value to the student. Dr. Mullin has some favorite ideas but no unfair bias and no sentimentality.

John T. McNeill.

The University of Chicago.

#### THE HOGAN SCHISM

By FRANCIS E. TOURSCHER. Philadelphia, Peter Reilly Company, 1930. 234 pages. \$2.00.

William Hogan, an Irish Roman Catholic priest who came to Philadelphia in 1820, was leader of the party which sought to retain the management of the property of a local parish in the hands of the board of lay

trustees. Writing from the point of view of the hierarchy which eventually won the dispute, the author finds it rather difficult to sympathize with this audacious priest. Yet he can not have been just an unsavoury character, for he secured a tight hold upon the affection and loyalties of many people. Undoubtedly he was troublesome, even dangerous to the authorities, who were themselves none too skillful in their handling of the situation. Hogan's personality, however, is really of secondary importance. More significant is the ten year controversy itself with its resort to the civil courts, to the pope, to the mob spirit. This volume presents a detailed record of it together with a number of important documents bearing on the case. Its author belongs to the Order of St. Augustine and is a member of the American Catholic Historical Society.

A. C. McGiffert, Jr.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

#### THE NEW CHURCH IN THE NEW WORLD

By MARGUERITE BLOCK. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1932. 464 pages. \$3.75.

We have in this study of Swedenborgianism not so much a history as a description of a body of Christians, never large numerically, yet very influential in their effect upon Christian thought.

Emanuel Swedenborg was born in Stockholm, 1688, son of the bishop of Skara. His childhood was spent in a pious and theological atmosphere, his education at the University was in the natural sciences. Brilliant in his field, he remained deeply religious—his scientific interests becoming religious but his religion never scientific. His training forced him to reject much of the older theology of his day but his scholarship never led him to an historical study of religion.

This is most clearly revealed in his attitude toward the Bible which was accepted as of supernatural origin. However, as the written word, it does not convey the true meaning; rather it contains a spiritual sense, as the soul in the body—a celestial sense perceived only by the angels. This celestial sense had been revealed to him.

This interpretation did help to give a finer spiritual conception of religion and to liberalize theology. Heaven and Hell became spiritual states of existence after death and the Trinity "the three essentials of one God."

This new religious thinking coming to America at the beginning of the National period was very acceptable to the new day. It was very much in accord with the protest against the hard and fast theology of the old theocracy. But for this very reason, perhaps, it soon became identified with all the "isms" of America's chaotic age of development—Spiritualism, Magnetism, Mesmerism, and Fourierism. Other religious groups, holding more firmly to the traditional positions, have developed more normally, leaving this more or less exotic form far outstripped.

Swedenborgianism represents a protest against traditional theology without having foundations in the facts of the history and philosophy of religion.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Crozer Theological Seminary.

## THE CELTIC CHURCH AND THE SEE OF PETER

By J. C. McNAUGHT. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1927. 118 pages. 4s.6d.

In opposition to the theory of an independent Celtic Church, the author argues that it was in communion with the Bishop of Rome, acknowledged his headship over the Church, and agreed with Rome on other doctrinal matters. Evidence is marshalled concerning the relations of the Celtic Church with Rome from the fourth to the ninth century. Although the book adds no new evidence or interpretations, it provides a very useful and thorough treatment of materials which, elsewhere, are scattered over a wide array of sources and secondary works. In view of the controversies over papal supremacy in the fifth century, the author seems dogmatic in asserting that "the whole Church, East and West, in St. Patrick's day acknowledged the headship of the Pope;" the Celtic Church in the sixth century was so isolated from Rome that no test cases arose; and the author minimizes the fact that many of the Welsh and Irish refused obedience on the questions of Easter and the tonsure up into the eighth century.

T. P. Oakley.

College of the City of New York.

